

[House Hearing, 107 Congress]
[From the U.S. Government Printing Office]

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2003

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

RALPH REGULA, Ohio, Chairman

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida	DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr., Oklahoma	STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
DAN MILLER, Florida	NANCY PELOSI, California
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky	ROSA L. DeLAURO, Connecticut
RANDY ``DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM, California	JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr., Illinois
KAY GRANGER, Texas	PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania	
DON SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania	

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

Craig Higgins, Susan Quantius, Susan Ross Firth, Meg Snyder,
and Francine Mack-Salvador, Subcommittee Staff

PART 5

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida, Chairman

RALPH REGULA, Ohio	DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
JERRY LEWIS, California	JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky	NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico	MARTIN OLAV SABO, Minnesota
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
TOM DeLAY, Texas	ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia
JIM KOLBE, Arizona	MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
SONNY CALLAHAN, Alabama	NANCY PELOSI, California
JAMES T. WALSH, New York	PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, Indiana
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
DAVID L. HOBSON, Ohio	JOSE E. SERRANO, New York
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr., Oklahoma	ROSA L. DeLAURO, Connecticut
HENRY BONILLA, Texas	JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
JOE KNOLLENBERG, Michigan	JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
DAN MILLER, Florida	ED PASTOR, Arizona
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia	CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	CHET EDWARDS, Texas
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr., Washington	ROBERT E. ``BUD'' CRAMER, Jr., Alabama
RANDY ``DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM, California	PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
TODD TIAHRT, Kansas	JAMES E. CLYBURN, South Carolina
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee	MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
TOM LATHAM, Iowa	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky	SAM FARR, California
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr., Illinois
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri	CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, Michigan
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire	ALLEN BOYD, Florida
KAY GRANGER, Texas	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania	STEVEN R. ROTHMAN, New Jersey
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California	
RAY LaHOOD, Illinois	
JOHN E. SWEENEY, New York	
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana	
DON SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania	
VIRGIL H. GOODE, Jr., Virginia	

James W. Dyer, Clerk and Staff Director

(ii)

Secretary of Education

Panel: No Child Left Behind
Elementary and Secondary Education

Panel: Foundations for Learning
Elementary and Secondary Education
Educational Research and Improvement
Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Administration for Children and Families

Panel: Teacher Recruitment, Preparation and
Development
Elementary and Secondary Education
Educational Research and Improvement
Postsecondary Education
English Language Acquisition

Panel: Transition into the Workforce
Vocational and Adult Education
Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
Postsecondary Education
Educational Research and Improvement

(iii)

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2003

Wednesday, April 10, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WITNESSES

ROD PAIGE, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
WILLIAM HANSEN, DEPUTY SECRETARY
THOMAS SKELLY, DIRECTOR, BUDGET SERVICE

Chairman's Opening Remarks

Mr. Regula. Okay. We will get started here this morning, and, Mr. Secretary, we are happy to welcome you and Mr. Hansen and Mr. Skelly, and we look forward to enlightenment this morning on how we can meet perhaps what is the most important challenge to the American people. I read the other day in a poll that people said education is the number one concern that they have, and so we collectively--your leadership and our support--have quite a challenge out there.

So, Mr. Secretary, we will look forward to your statement. We will put your full statement in the record, and you can summarize for us as you choose.

Secretary's Introductory Remarks

Secretary Paige. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of President Bush's 2003 budget for the U.S. Department of Education.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

I want to begin by once again thanking the members of this committee, along with your colleagues in the House, for your hard work and many contributions to securing passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which the President signed into law in early January.

I take it as a vote of confidence, in the new law and in the Department's ability to carry out that law, that the Congress followed up its approval of the No Child Left Behind Act by providing a \$6.7 billion increase for the Department in the fiscal year 2002. This was the largest of a series of increases that have more than doubled the Department's discretionary budget since fiscal year 1996. These new resources, which will be available for the school year beginning this fall, will help States, school districts, and schools implement the No Child Left Behind Act as expeditiously as possible.

FY 2003 EDUCATION BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2003, the President's budget was driven by the overriding concern of defending our Nation and people from the threat of terrorism following the terrible events of September the 11th. Most of the new resources in the President's proposal for 2003 are dedicated to the Defense Department, which continues to wage war against terrorism outside our borders, and to Homeland Security for efforts to help our States and communities prevent and prepare for new attacks on our freedom.

Nevertheless, our 2003 budget for education builds on the major increases provided in recent years and gives States and school districts the resources they need to implement the changes called for in the No Child Left Behind Act. The request would provide \$50.3 billion in discretionary appropriations, an increase of \$1.4 billion, or 2.8 percent, over 2002 level. With this increase, the Federal investment in education will have climbed nearly \$15 billion, or 41 percent, over the past 3 years.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

I have emphasized the very significant increase provided by

this committee for the Department in recent years to make the larger point about President Bush's strategy for investing in education. For this Administration the No Child Left Behind Act was not just about how much we spend at the Federal level on education, but rather about how to increase the return on that investment. We have little to show, for example, for the nearly \$190 billion we have already invested in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act since 1965.

Dramatic growth in State and local funding for elementary and secondary education the past decade also has failed to significantly close the achievement gap for poor and minority students, or even to raise overall student achievement in any meaningful way. Increased funding may be one answer, but it is clearly not the only answer for our education problems.

In addition, while we all agree on the importance and promise of programs like Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, that is simply not the case for every program reauthorized in the No Child Left Behind Act. Many of the smaller ESEA programs are redundant, serving the same purposes and populations as larger, more flexible programs, while others do not appear to actually work and still others have already achieved their original purpose or are just too small to have a national impact on schools.

LEVERAGING FEDERAL RESOURCES

These realities gave us some clear guidelines for responding to the dramatically different budget perspectives resulting from the combination of September 11th and decline in economic performance. First, we believe that the No Child Left Behind Act provided a real opportunity to leverage existing Federal education resources already in the pipeline following the large increases of recent years. Funding decisions should be based on the principles that drove the No Child Left Behind Act, including increased accountability, greater choice for parents and students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds who attend low performance schools, more flexibility for States and school districts and a stronger emphasis on teaching methods grounded in scientifically based research, especially in teaching our children to read.

TARGETING FEDERAL RESOURCES

Second, we remain committed to targeting Federal education dollars to poor and minority students and others who are most likely to be left behind by our education system. One way to do this would be to redirect resources from narrow categorical programs to more flexible formula grant programs that better focus on the student and schools with the greatest need for assistance.

The results of these guidelines is a fairly straightforward budget request that we believe provides effective support for turning the vision reflected in the No Child Left Behind Act into the reality of better schools and improved student achievement.

We are proposing significant increases for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, Special Education Grants to States, and Pell Grants. Other priorities include major increases for the research-based Reading First Program and for further research to develop and disseminate proven education practices.

We would maintain funding for large flexible State grant programs, such as Improving Teacher Quality State grants, which have received big increases in recent years. The request would consolidate and eliminate many smaller and less flexible categorical grants which in nearly every case could be continued at the discretion of the State and local authorities under other authorities.

These are rough times for those charged with preparing a responsible Federal budget, and they demand tough choices. I believe the President's 2003 budget made those tough choices in a way that is fully consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act. I hope you will seriously consider our proposal, and I would be happy to answer any questions that you have. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am joined by the Deputy Secretary of Education Bill Hansen and by Tom Skelly, Director of the Budget Service.

[The statement of Secretary Paige follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

RETURN EXPECTED FROM FEDERAL INVESTMENT

Mr. Regula. Well, thank you very much. I just have one or two questions, because we have busy subcommittee members, and I want to give them all a chance. I would also say to the members we will try to stay to the 5-minute rule this morning so that everybody gets an opportunity and then there will be a second round.

I was struck by something you said, and that is that we have little to show for great expenditures over the last, what, 20 years, both State and local. And I guess what we don't want to do is make a mistake of funding things that your successor 20 years from now will say the same thing about, because we want to get results, and that is where your leadership will count.

Secretary Paige. We are very concerned about results. We understand the Federal resources to be investments for which we expect returns. Our comment results from test scores like what is reflected by this chart. The red line is the age 9 NAEP reading scores. But this could be a chart for math or any other subject. We just chose this one to illustrate this. And we can see the flat line from 1984 through 1999. The blue represents the Federal funding. This is Federal funding only--specifically ESEA funding. If we would show this chart on reading scores using local and State funding as well, this would be an even more spectacular difference. Our goal is to link these two things to make sure that the Federal funding also pulls this flat line of test scores in the same upward direction.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

PRIORITIZING EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. Regula. That is a terrific challenge, which leads me to my second question. That is we would like to work with your Department and maybe in the wisdom of the committee make some changes or adjustments in the allocation of funds; i.e., for example, from Title I to teacher quality improvement. Do you feel that that can be accomplished because, you know, different things work?

Secretary Paige. We are eager to hear your ideas, Mr. Chairman, and to work with you on those.

Mr. Regula. Well, we will have a few.

Mr. Obey.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I don't think I am going to ask any questions in 5 minutes. I think I am just going to make a few observations. I assume, Mr. Secretary, that the Administration feels that with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act that we now have these programs aligned in such a manner that we have a better chance than we had before of actually producing results with the dollars that are spent. In fact, that is essentially what you said in your opening statement.

My problem is when I look at this budget I see just the opposite. What I see here is a prescription for benign neglect, if I can borrow a phrase from Pat Moynihan from another generation on another issue. We have had annual increases averaging about 13 to 14 percent over the past 5 years in education funding. Now that we have these programs aligned the way the Administration says it largely wants them, we see that average 5-year annual increase cut back to less than 3 percent and, in real terms, there is no increase in this budget overall. This budget was prepared last year. Since then we have had an economic tsunami hit many States.

DEFICIT BUDGETS IN STATES--IMPACT ON EDUCATION

New Jersey, for instance, I am told is going to have a \$6 billion deficit over the next 3 years. Wisconsin has a \$1.1 billion deficit. There are at least 37 States that have deficits large enough to require repair by their State legislatures. Yet, the Federal Government, having now marched all over the country in signing ceremonies to brag about what we have done to get these programs shaped up, is now creating, in my view, the mother of all mandates with very little resources to help States attack the challenges presented to them by this new bill.

NEW FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

We require all kinds of new actions to be taken by States. We require new standards for teachers. We require all kinds of testing, and yet we provide very little by way of resources to back it up. Most States are facing a squeeze that is going to require them to actually cut back on funding, and that doesn't apply just to elementary and secondary education. I have just seen the Republican majority in my legislature, for instance, recommend substantial reductions in funding for the University of Wisconsin, and that is being replicated all over the country.

COST OF IMPLEMENTING NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Do you have any estimate of how much it is going to cost to implement all of the requirements and standards of the bill that passed with so much acclaim last year?

Secretary Paige. Do I understand you to ask me if I have an idea of implementation cost resulting from---

Mr. Obey. If we are going to turn the congressional and presidential rhetoric into reality, then we have to make certain that each of the standards, each of the requirements laid out in that bill, whether it is for the required level of teacher preparation or the required amount of testing, et cetera---

Secretary Paige. I see.

Mr. Obey. There is a laundry list. There are at least 17 different mandates in that bill. What is your estimate of the total cost in order to meet those mandates by 2006 or 2007?

Secretary Paige. I understand the question differently now, and I understand the question to mean what will it cost the various States and entities that will be implementing these regulations and laws.

Mr. Obey. Whichever level of government foots the bill.

Secretary Paige. Right.

Mr. Obey. What is your estimate of the added cost that will be incurred?

IMPLEMENTATION COST A FUNCTION OF MANAGEMENT

Secretary Paige. The reason that will be difficult, sir, for me to answer is that it will be a function of the effectiveness of the leadership and the management in the implementation process. Many of the entities, well, all of them differ, in their efficiency in implementing these acts, and---

Mr. Obey. But you must have some ballpark estimate.

TESTING COSTS

Secretary Paige. I will give an example about test development. The budget has in it \$387 million to implement--I mean, to construct the test. We think that is actually an overfunding of the cost for implementing the test, that is, for the development of the test. And if we talk about the actual administration of the test, many States and entities have shown a cost of as high as 10 or 12 dollars per child to implement the test.

In the Houston Independent School District, where I worked,

we implemented and administered the Stanford-9 for less than \$3 per student. That is why I say that it is a function of how efficient the operation works, and many of the operations need a lot of improvement in that category.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Secretary, I guess I am not going to get an answer to my question. We had a lot of rhetoric under the Clinton Administration and under the Bush I Administration. Both previous administrations promised the Moon in terms of what we were going to get in student achievement results over 5 years, and both of them missed the mark by a country mile. And you are going to miss the mark by a country mile with the No Child Left Behind Act, unless both the States and the Federal Government, along with locals, back up that rhetoric with dollars. I don't see those dollars in this budget. So to me, not even getting into the fact that your budget is \$7 billion short of meeting the authorized levels in that bill, I see virtually no initiative being made when you aggregate the entire budget. I see virtually no overall added initiative on the part of the Federal Government to actually share these costs.

ADEQUACY OF BUDGET REQUEST TO FUND NCLB

So I think if we are serious in keeping this law on the books, then Congress is going to be embarrassed if it doesn't wind up eliminating the new requirements it has in the rules to have a roll call every time we have a new unfunded Federal mandate, because this bill is the mother of new mandates without much by way of Federal resources to back it up.

Secretary Paige. Mr. Obey, I think my best answer would be that we think that the dollars contained in the President's proposed budget adequately fund the activities required for under the act.

Mr. Obey. Well, Mr. Secretary, there couldn't be a more clear disagreement between you and me than the one you have just defined. I think this budget is woefully inadequate to meet the promises. This budget means that the bill that just passed the Congress is a business as usual bill, because the usual practice in Washington is to make large promises that are never backed up with the cash. That happened all the way going back to Lyndon Johnson, and I think we are continuing that sorry record. There is no need to do that if we actually back up those promises with resources. But apparently we are not going to do that.

Secretary Paige. Well, certainly, I thank you and respect you for your interest and leadership in this issue. I would like to have a lot more discussion with you about these differences, but I would like to be judged based on the student's achievement growth, and when we come back 2 years from now and see this curve pointing in a different direction, the dollars that we spend would have produced the results we want. But the trend that we have now is the dollars that we are spending are not producing the results that we want. So what we want to measure is not how much we spend, but how much students grow.

Mr. Obey. Well, it seems strange to me that after fighting as hard as you have fought in order to get these programs

reshaped so that they would produce, you are not now putting any bullets in the gun to actually make them work.

Secretary Paige. But I think I am, Mr. Obey, I really do, and would like to talk to you more about that.

Mr. Obey. My time is up. We are just going to have to agree that we have a different perception of how this budget solves that problem.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Well, I think, as you suggest, in a couple years you would like to see those lines converged.

Secretary Paige. Well, I don't know if they will be quite converged, but they will be pointing in the same direction. They are going to be pointing in the same direction, I promise you that.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Wicker.

TITLE I--TARGETING AND STATE ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Wicker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for being here. My first question is going to be about Title I funding. I notice, Mr. Secretary, that you mentioned the importance of targeting the funds to the needy districts, and I couldn't help being intrigued with what my chairman mentioned about the fact that he might have an idea about moving some Title I funds to get teacher quality improvement. This is a debate that we expect to have, because it is so important. The fact of the matter is that the Title I program has grown by 40 percent over the last 5 years, and while we are interested in individual students, we do this State by State. And unfortunately, my State of Mississippi, which has some of the poorest school districts in the Nation, did not receive an increase in Title I allocation until last year. We estimate that Mississippi will receive a \$6 million increase in Title I funding this year, in a year when the entire funding nationwide is \$1.5--the entire increase is \$1.5 billion. Despite receiving our first increase in several years, the State with the poorest school districts has actually declined in the total amount of Title I dollars from 1.4 percent of the national total to 1.2 percent of the national total.

I just wondered if you would comment on that, Mr. Secretary, or any member of the panel, and also when will the Department be releasing the funding data for the upcoming year, and what factors will you plan to use to accurately measure the changing need of the depressed school districts that we really want to target with this program?

CENSUS DATA BASIS FOR ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Skelly. Mr. Wicker, the Title I distributions are largely based on data we get from the Census Department. Throughout the----

Mr. Wicker. Do you think you are getting good data when the poorest State in the Nation actually gets a smaller amount of the pie?

Mr. Skelly. The data, you know, change every 10 years with the census, and they do updates periodically between those

decades. Throughout the 1990s, the appropriations bill contained some language which we call ``hold-harmless,' ' which basically held States at the same level that they had in previous years, even if their percentage share of the number of children qualified for Title I services went down in the State. So some of this is just catch-up with those years when there was that ``hold-harmless' ' provision. There has been growth in other States in the number of Title I children, eligible children, beyond what you have had in Mississippi, I believe. The data for this year will come out probably the end of this month, April, and we should know more what the distribution will be then for Mississippi.

Mr. Wicker. Okay. Well, I look forward to continuing to work with the Department on this, as well as my chairman, to make sure that we just target the neediest school districts.

Mr. Hansen, if you would like to grab the microphone, you seem to be wanting to add something to this discussion.

TITLE I TARGETED GRANTS PROGRAM

Mr. Hansen. I just want to highlight the fact that our budget increase in Title I is targeted through the Targeted Grant formula, and I think this will have a positive effect on districts such as yours. So when we get the data out, we would be happy to sit with you and discuss this more. But that is our priority as well, to make sure that the increase does go to the Targeted formula.

Mr. Wicker. Very good.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Let me read to this subcommittee some information that we often get about the fact that the United States is said to lag behind other countries in educational performance. This happens to come from the Heritage Foundation, but they are using data that they received from international studies by Boston College. It says, ``American eighth graders ranked 19th out of 38 countries on the most recent international mathematics comparison, behind countries such as Malaysia, the Russian Federation, and Bulgaria. American students scored 18th out of 38 countries in science on the TIMSS 1995 survey which tested 12th graders. American students were ranked 19th out of 21 countries in both math and science general knowledge.' '

Mr. Secretary, if you say that at a teachers' meeting, they are likely to charge the podium.

Secretary Paige. Yes, I had that happen.

Mr. Wicker. Even if they are your cousins and some of your good friends, and they say this data is skewed, that it couldn't possibly be correct, because we make such a valiant effort in this country in universal education. I just wondered if we need to quit using this data; or if it is accurate, is it helpful to us, and would you comment on that?

Secretary Paige. I think we absolutely must continue to use those kinds of comparisons so that we can understand what our challenge is and where we are. I think there has been magnificent effort in past years. I have used reading as an example. The Reading Excellence Act spent \$300 million a year

in trying to improve reading, with very little improvement in reading. I don't think this was a lack of effort on the part of teachers. I think teachers were trying really hard, but the pedagogy did not include the appropriate science. It was not backed up by the scientific underpinning that could show that the methods were the appropriate methods.

Now we know a lot about teaching reading, and we know the science of teaching reading has been good, and so we began to see rapid increases in student reading performances because the pedagogy has been straightened out, but we need to know more about that in math and science.

Mr. Wicker. But with regard to math and science, do we lag behind Bulgaria in teaching our students math and science?

Secretary Paige. I think the evidence is pretty clear that we do lag behind them.

Mr. Wicker. So it is not the fact that Bulgaria only tries to teach their top 50th percentile or something like that? This is accurate data?

Secretary Paige. Well----

Mr. Wicker. And as Secretary of Education, you support--I know you don't support the result, but you stand by this data, and you think it is something that we have to address?

Secretary Paige. Well, all information like that has errors of vulnerability and errors of weaknesses, but I think in the main, the idea that Bulgaria leads us in math and science is correct. I do stand behind that, yes.

Mr. Wicker. Thank you.

Mr. Regula. Mrs. Northup.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND TESTING

Mrs. Northup. Thank you. Welcome, Mr. Secretary. I am so excited about the No Child Left Behind Act, particularly because of the accountability portion of it. I think last year when you were here you complimented Kentucky for their outcomes-based program. Basically in Kentucky we give great flexibility to our schools, and then we judge what the results are at the end of the year, at the end of many years. And the previous Secretary of Education congratulated Kentucky every time he was here.

But what I have found in Kentucky is that rewards are a lot easier than sanctions. In fact, after over a decade, we have had years of rewards and not one sanction, or maybe one or two sanctions--very few. The result is that we spend more money. We spend more money on those that are lagging behind. We send in specialty groups. We have excuses. We exempt more students from actually taking the test, but they continue to lag, and like I said, we found sanctions are a lot harder than rewards.

The one thing we don't have is information in the hands of every parent of every student. What we do is test fourth and eighth graders, for example, in reading. We test third and seventh graders in math. So everybody gets a test every year, but you only get a test every 4 years in the same subject that would be comparable. And the scores are released by a school, so the school either succeeds or fails. So a particular parent might know their child is behind in fourth grade. They go to school. There is a plan for addressing that deficit, and then

you don't know until eighth grade whether or not anything has improved.

I believe putting information in the hands of every single parent and every single teacher, quite frankly, will give them the information they need to address the problems.

ANNUAL TESTING REQUIREMENT

However, I know that there are States--and Kentucky is one of them--that are asking for an exemption from the yearly test. Do you intend to grant any of those?

Secretary Paige. My intent is to carry out the congressional intent, and I intend to be very aggressive about making sure that that intent is carried out. I think the simple answer to that is I am going to be very, very reluctant to grant exemptions, because I think that is what the spirit of the legislation says, and so the probable answer to that is no, we are not going to exempt people from that. Unless there is some clear, crisp Federal mandate contained in law that is unequivocal, we intend for them to do what the legislation says.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE FOR TESTING REQUIREMENT

Mrs. Northup. Am I correct in thinking that States do not have to design a test and implement it until the 2005-2006 school year?

Secretary Paige. That is the date in the legislation for the implementation, yes.

Mrs. Northup. Four years?

Secretary Paige. Yes. But we would encourage States not to wait till that date. We think that it will be a mistake to wait until that date. We would like to see that earlier, and people from our shop are going to be working with each individual State to try to make sure that the congressional intent is carried out.

Mrs. Northup. Well, it is just hard to imagine that the improvements will come if accountability means that it isn't started for 4 years. There are off-the-shelf tests that States can select while they are developing their own. I just wondered if there would be any support or any pressure for moving that day forward or for requiring some off-the-shelf test in the meantime until they can develop their own.

Secretary Paige. We would encourage them to move as rapidly as possible, but I think the law does permit them to begin at that date. Many States are beginning earlier than that date.

Mrs. Northup. Are they?

Secretary Paige. Yes.

Mrs. Northup. Do you anticipate that rewards or positive recognition is also at the Federal level going to be a lot easier than sanctions?

Secretary Paige. I am aware how that works in many places, but I am committed to carrying out the letter of the law. In fact, we met with the chief State school officers, at which time I advised them that I would take a pledge to obey the law and enforce the law, and I fully intend to do that, and I frankly asked them in the course of that meeting not to submit waiver requests to me.

Mrs. Northup. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Regula. Mrs. Lowey.

Mrs. Lowey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Secretary, I want to join my colleagues in welcoming you here today. I just want to pursue, Mr. Secretary, the questions that Mr. Obey asked.

TEACHER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Many of us were very enthusiastic about the new Federal commitment to the education of our children. For those of us who have been working on these issues a very long time, we were pleased that the authorization bill passed, and that is why I was so surprised, frankly, when I saw the President's budget request for education. It seems that the administration forgot everything it said as we passed ESEA, because in my judgment after reviewing the budget request it does leave millions of children behind.

My first question is this: Both you and the President have said that one way to ensure that every child receives a quality education is to have a quality teacher in every classroom. I couldn't agree more. However, the administration's budget recommends a \$162.5 million cut in teacher quality programs, a decrease of 5 percent. Could you explain how you expect States to recruit and train the teachers we desperately need in our schools with 5 percent less than they received last year? I know you and I would agree that the most important factor in a child's education is the teacher in the classroom, and if you could respond to that, I would be most appreciative.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR TEACHER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Secretary Paige. Thank you. I think we agree that the teacher probably is the most important factor in the child's learning, the classroom learning. Parents are the most important factor, but the teachers in the classroom matter. And that is why the President's budget contains a request for \$2.5 billion for teacher quality, and so that is we think a substantial funding base, which continues from last year, the 2002 level. What States and school---

Mrs. Lowey. Excuse me. You would agree, though, that it is 5 percent less?

Secretary Paige. No, we would not.

Mrs. Lowey. A decrease of 5 percent?

Secretary Paige. No, we do not agree it is a decrease of 5 percent. Let us comment on that.

Mr. Hansen. Congresswoman, if you add all of our programs together, and I have seen a chart that tries to suggest that there is a cut of the amount you are talking about---

Mrs. Lowey. Right.

Mr. Hansen. But what that chart does not include was the fact that we were able to use more than 5 percent of our Title I funds for teachers, and we do have a billion dollar increase for the Title I program, which could mean an additional \$50 million could be used for teacher quality. We also have---

Mrs. Lowey. Well, if I could interrupt at that point, and maybe I could skip to the next question. You could discuss them

both. I have a real problem with the Title I funding as well. So I don't understand that. We have a problem with teacher quality, a problem with Title I. So you take from Title I to improve teacher quality?

Mr. Hansen. It is not taking from Title I. This is what Title I is all about, to make sure we have quality teachers in every classroom. This is--but also if I could finish. In making sure the chart is comparing apples to apples, we also have an expanded loan forgiveness program for teachers to go teach in the areas of math and science in low-income areas, and this is expanding loan forgiveness from \$5,000 to \$17,500. Those dollars are not reflected on that chart.

``CRAYOLA CREDIT'' TAX CREDIT

We also had in the budget a tax proposal, a tax deduction for teachers, the so-called ``Crayola credit,'' to give teachers a \$400 tax deduction for out-of-pocket expenses. As passed by the Economic Stimulus Act, that deduction is \$250.

So I think if you add all of those things to the chart, we do have an increase, and I think, as the Secretary said, too, this is building on a tremendous increase from last year. There was about \$2 billion spent last year. This year it is over \$3 billion. You can go back to 1996 and the amount of money that was spent from the Federal level on teacher quality was \$300 million. So an awful lot has been done over the last couple of years to build up that base, and our budget this year does have an increase for teacher quality when you add up all of the programs.

TITLE I FUNDING

Mrs. Lowey. Well, because my time is limited, and I would like to certainly continue that discussion, the new ESEA law also authorizes school districts to receive 40 percent of their State's average per pupil expenditure for each low-income child in the district. As I am sure you are aware, Title I funding does not meet the overwhelming need across the country, particularly in urban school districts. While the Administration's budget proposes a billion dollar increase in Title I funding, the funding level is \$16.7 billion below full funding for Title I under the new ESEA law. In fact, it doesn't even keep up with inflation.

Let me share with you the impact of that in my area in New York City. In New York City alone, only 30 percent, one-third, of eligible low-income students was served by Title I in the last school year. This means that 326,000 students are being left behind. Under the Administration's budget, even with the \$1 billion increase, 256,000 eligible students will still miss out.

TITLE I BUDGET REQUEST

Again, as Mr. Obey said before, if we are passing this bill, raising expectations that the Administration is truly focused on improving education, how do you explain why the Administration is not advocating for a real increase in this vital program?

Mr. Hansen. Congresswoman, I would like to also point out that the Title I budget has gone from \$6.7 billion to \$11.4 billion over the last 5 years, and the issue of full funding Title I is not identified in the No Child Left Behind bill. There is not a formula for ``fully funding,' ' quote unquote, Title I. The Title I program today serves 15 million students out of the 50-plus million students in our Nation's schools, and, the way the program works, we do believe that it is reaching those students that have the most needs, the schools that are targeted.

Mrs. Lowey. I did mention it was the ESEA bill that included the Title I funding, but again, and then I will move on quickly to another program which I don't understand--oh, it is red light. I guess I can't move on. Okay.

Mrs. Northup [presiding]. We will do another round.

Mrs. Lowey. Let me just conclude by saying I really share the verbal commitment to improving education. I think we all feel strongly about this, and I know you can't mandate excellence and we are all trying to make these programs as effective as we can, but I don't understand how there can be this disconnect between a focus on the authorization bill and yet when you look at the dollars that are going to implement the program the dollars aren't there. So I hope we will have a further opportunity to talk about this.

Mrs. Northup. There will be another round.

Secretary Paige. I just wanted to offer our staff to come by and get into some of these details and the concept shift. For example, Title I focuses on schools. But when you discuss individuals, that puts it in a different realm. So the Title I program is a school-based program. And we would like to have an opportunity to come by and discuss these issues with you and hear your ideas.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you. Ms. Granger.

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Ms. Granger. Thank you. I want to commend the Administration on the 29 additional safe schools and healthy schools initiative for the partnerships. I am going to visit--I think there are three of those schools in Texas, and before the end of the year I will get to visit those schools, but I was concerned about the reduction of \$103 million for the safe and drug-free schools initiative. I had a summit in my district in December, a safe schools summit. Five hundred students attended and I was pleased that the students felt safer than they had 10 years ago, when I had that same sort of summit on safety as a mayor. But they still had great concerns.

So I would like to know, looking at this \$103 million reduction, how committed is the Administration to drug-free schools and safe schools, and how are those funds going to be used?

Secretary Paige. I am going to ask Tom Skelly to comment on it after I make this comment. The \$103 million decrease eliminates funding for three national activities, not school-based activities, or activities where the students really are. So then, the national activity cost has been streamlined.

Tom, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. Skelly. I would just add that the budget level-fundsthe basic Safe and Drug-Free School program at \$644 million. It is the same amount we had back in 2001. It is the same amount we have in 2002. The Secretary noted the \$103 million was just for three brand new categorical programs which were first funded in 2002. Those three, like 37 other categorical programs, have been terminated in the budget. The idea is to allow States to use more flexible State grant funds that they receive to fund those kinds of activities, if they choose to continue them, rather than to separately fund individual programs.

Ms. Granger. All right. Thank you.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you. Ms. Pelosi.

TITLE I FUNDING

Ms. Pelosi. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Mr. Secretary, welcome to you and to your colleagues. In only 5 minutes I am going to have to touch lightly on some of my questions, but I want to associate myself with some of the comments made by Mr. Wicker earlier. I think that the fact that Title I is seriously underfunded by \$4.6 billion below the authorized level for fiscal year 2003 contributes to the problem with the ``hold-harmless'' provision which Mississippi would benefit from. California also suffers in that formulation, given the increasing number of low-income students in both of our States.

TECHNOLOGY CHALLENGE ACT

I also want to associate myself with his remarks about math and science. I hope that we could have a heavy focus--there is a tech--a training bill that is--it is an authorization bill that tries to address some of the concerns Mr. Wicker put forth, and it is an authorization for grants, Technology Challenge Act, recognizing that our economic growth is highly dependent on our technological innovation. Yet some of the statistics that Mr. Wicker mentioned are devastating. The number of undergraduate degrees awarded in science, engineering and technology have been flatly declining since 1987. I would hope that at some point we could have a line item in the Department of Education bill very specifically to address that. We are now working on the authorization side to try--and the appropriating side in the other committee, where grants can be made from the National Science Foundation for this purpose. But it is an education function, and I would hope it would have a higher priority.

FY 2003 BUDGET REQUEST

But I want to get to the heart of the matter, and that was what Mr. Obey was talking about earlier. We all celebrated the Leave No Child Behind bill, and now we have a Leave Millions of Children Behind budget. There is just no question, Mr. Secretary, with all due respect, the figures don't add up. As they said to a young child, when they said, testing his math, 2 and 2, he said 4, and they said that is good, he said it is not good, it is perfect. The figures have to add up. So if you have a bill that you celebrate that meets the needs--or begins to

meet the needs of leaving no child behind and then you submit a budget that is \$7.2 billion short of the funding level agreed to in H.R. 1, it isn't even good, it is certainly not perfect, and perfect we are way off from.

So this is devastating. It is devastating. I don't know how the Administration could come in with a budget so soon after stating the need and raising the hopes.

Now, when we talk about leaving, most of these children of course that will be left behind are low-income children. Even in the H.R. 1, forgetting any authorization of documented need, even in just the proposal in H.R. 1, that would be \$16 billion. We are at \$11.35 billion. We are short that much just in the Title I section of it. It doesn't add up.

The other part of it is--and you said you thought that this budget adequately funded H.R. 1. I am just using your words. You said it is adequately funded. What was H.R. 1, then, pie in the sky, I mean, figures that were never even anticipated would be met, where the rubber meets the road in appropriation?

BUDGET AND TEST DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Then you said--and forgive me, please, this is how I heard it--you said there is too much money for test development. I think that that--I mean, you could not possibly have been thinking of States with multilingual students which need to develop yearly assessments in each language. Yet there is no additional money for bilingual education, and I know you know better than anyone, coming from where you do, the great diversity that we have in our schools, the many children that we are blessed with whose first language is not English.

So this, Mr. Secretary, just does not add up. It really falls very short. And, again, I think your budget proposal should be called the Leave Millions of Children Behind budget. If you would like to comment.

Secretary Paige. Yes, I would like to comment, and my comments would first of all begin with the idea that in 1994, when you reauthorized the ESEA, there was a testing requirement included. The Congress did not see fit to spend a large---

Ms. Pelosi. Excuse me, Mr. Secretary, because we all have such limited time can we just go from the last 3 months where the Administration in a very bipartisan way passed and signed a bill, much heralded, with a standard that gave people some hope about where we go from here, and 3 months later we have a budget that is \$7.2 billion short of that, which you say adequately--I don't know how you adequately fund a \$7.2 billion shortfall. I would really like to hear that, adequately meet the needs of a bill with the \$7.2 billion. That would make the miracle of the loaves and the fishes look like minor leagues.

Secretary Paige. In order to respond to that, I would have to put this in context. The context is that this time we have \$387 million for test development, for the additional test, over and above that which was required in 1994 when there are no dollars. So then compared to that, this is spectacular, and I think the Congress is to be congratulated for authorizing those dollars and those expenditures. And that can be----

Ms. Pelosi. We are talking about the appropriation, though, with all due respect, Mr. Secretary, not the authorization. We

are talking about the appropriation.

Secretary Paige. Well, I guess my comment is that I think that the test can be developed with the dollars that are provided that have been appropriated.

Ms. Pelosi. And you include in that bilingual--testing of bilingual----

Secretary Paige. All the tests that are required by H.R. 1.

Ms. Pelosi. Well, that is one part of the question. I would like to work with you more closely on that, because there is no specific funding for the bilingual challenges that we have.

Secretary Paige. Well, we will be certainly available for any additional discussion that you wish to have.

Ms. Pelosi. Thanks, Mr. Secretary.

Mrs. Northup. Thanks, Ms. Pelosi.

Mr. Istook.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. Istook. Thank you. Secretary Paige, I appreciate the chance to talk with you, and I would note since the topic was bilingual education, limited English proficiency, I am certainly pleased to know that we are trying to expand the accountability for the progress that students are making year by year or the lack of it, of course. Measuring that advancement and requiring that they attain English proficiency is essential to guaranteeing opportunity for those students.

CHARTER SCHOOL FACILITY FINANCING

I wanted to cover a couple of items with you. One, I appreciate the charter school credit enhancement initiative that the Administration has; it is certainly an issue that I have been active on, and I know you have requested a \$100 million allocation on that. I wanted to ask you about that. Knowing the serious capital needs of charter schools and the challenge of procuring the loans, the funds that are necessary for the start-up cost, how far under your proposal can this \$100 million go? I am not sure what the requirements are going to be for leveraging it. For example, does it require a certain amount of private match so that \$100 million can be leveraged into \$500 million, or whatever that figure may be? Could you give us a little more detail on how far this \$100 million can go?

Secretary Paige. Yes. Thank you. I am going to ask Bill to comment on that.

Mr. Hansen. Thank you, Congressman. A couple of notes. We are, as we speak, getting ready to announce our first \$25 million awards slate in the next couple of weeks, and looking at the proposals that we have received in this arena, it is apparent that we will probably be able to leverage somewhere between 5 to 10 percent depending on what type of instruments they are using, whether it is credit enhancement or loan guarantees, insurance pools or what other mechanisms----

Mr. Istook. Five to 10 percent, meaning you would have a multiplier of 10 to 20 times that this would leverage?

Mr. Hansen. Right. And it is our thought that the \$100 million proposal--which actually is built on the charter school

homestead fund proposal, which would be \$350 million over 2 years, and that is what this money would hopefully be building towards--would have a leveraging effect somewhere in the 7 to 10 percent range, with a multiplier of 7 to 10 times.

Mr. Istook. Right. Which means that, for example, through this program it might help charter schools to attain capital of up to a billion dollars, for example, to meet their needs?

Mr. Hansen. Exactly.

Mr. Istook. That is good, because I think those details are very important to the program design. You certainly would not want 100 percent for a program like that.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Let me ask, Mr. Secretary, on a different matter, I recognize that so much of the work the Department does with accountability depends upon the evaluations that are made internally. The people you have in the Department are crucial to this. You have, I think, about 5,000 people. So much of the money that goes out with grants, the effectiveness of those grants depends upon the effectiveness of the bureaucrats that administer them, the readers of the grants, the reviewers of them, and your Department has been historically challenged, as you well know.

We had an incident reported a couple of years ago that showed they could not account for hundreds of millions of dollars, which would certainly go a long way towards meeting some of the concerns I know of some of the other members that we have here. I would like to hear your comments upon how you are getting ahold of managing a department that has not been managed. Can the same people be turned around that have been more involved with bureaucratic inertia than in true education advancement as shown by the chart there? How can you accomplish anything that requires you to turn around the effectiveness and the attitudes of several thousand people in your own Department? How are you doing that?

Secretary Paige. This was one of our very first challenges, and we had several Congress people very interested in this problem that we had. We put a lot of energy into it, and I think that we have had spectacular improvement. And because Bill Hansen, my Deputy Secretary, was directly responsible for the leadership and the successes that we have had, I am going to ask him to comment on that.

Bill.

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT EFFORT

Mr. Hansen. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Really, almost exactly a year ago Secretary Paige put into place a three-pronged effort to go after the problems. We put together a management improvement team to help identify and diagnose all of our outstanding problems, and when we got into a war room and threw them all up on the wall and got the GAO and IG and outside audit recommendations, there were over 600 of them. And we have been busy this last year fixing each and every one of them, which we have now done.

We also announced a major blueprint to fix the systemic

issues so that we don't keep having the hot spots to fix at the court level, and we came up with the 160 institutional processes that are about internal controls, so we don't have duplicate payments, about making sure we have got programs in place to reward people when they do things right, but to also hold them accountable when things aren't done right. We have cut up dozens of our credit cards; and we had some problems in that area. We have also changed our whole purchase card system and are making it much more accountable.

Mr. Istook. That is on the financial side alone, as opposed to the effectiveness side that you are discussing.

Mr. Hansen. And just two fronts, and part of the Secretary's original effort here was to get new senior management in place. We had gone 5 years without an Assistant Secretary for Management and 3 years without a Chief Financial Officer. We now have both of those gentlemen in place and are hoping to get a clean financial statement and a clean audit for the first time in about a half a dozen years.

We are also working with our senior career management. We have some of the best senior career managers in government, and we are trying to mobilize them and utilize them and put them to work and make sure that we have the right mechanisms in place to deliver our programs effectively. And frankly, that is where we are. We deliver \$50 billion in discretionary aid and another \$40 billion in student loans, and that is what our 5,000 people do. We deliver these Federal resources to school districts, States and individuals. And that is what we are working towards, to have the best systems in place to make sure that we don't have fraud, we don't have abuse, and that we have the efficient delivery of these funds to the recipients.

Mr. Istook. I appreciate that, and certainly I want to help, and I hope you will come to me and the others on this committee as far as any legislative changes or tweaks that we may be able to assist you with to accomplish those internal goals.

Secretary Paige. Thank you for that offer. We will take you up on it.

Mr. Istook. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mrs. Northup. Mr. Miller.

GROWTH IN EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. Miller. Good morning, Mr. Secretary. I am hearing comments from my friends outside the aisle about this doom and gloom budget that we are presenting, and I want to go back to an early page of your report which talks about the total amount of spending for education. In 2001 we spent \$42.1 billion for education, the Department of Education budget, and now we are proposing a \$56.5 billion increase. An increase from last year to this one is not a large one, but this total amount of increase in 2 years is a 40 percent increase in education. Is that right? The Department of Education spending has gone up 4 years from the last budget of the Clinton Administration?

Secretary Paige. That is correct.

Mr. Miller. That is a big increase to get 40 percent in a 2-year period for education. I think that is something. You know, it is amazing, now we are in a war-type budget this year

and things are a little more challenged. But I was reading page 2 of your budget summary, but if you look at the total budget, going from \$42.1 to \$56.5 billion. That is a big increase. If you go back to 1996 in that area, we have got 150 percent increases. So that, you know, has to be one of the fastest growing parts of the budget. Am I wrong in those numbers?

DISCRETIONARY AND MANDATORY BUDGET INCREASES

Secretary Paige. You are close, but let's give you the specific numbers.

Mr. Skelly. If you talk just about the discretionary appropriation which your committee deals with each year, we would exclude the mandatory numbers. Those tend to skew the comparisons. You are right, there has been a very large increase in recent years, going up 123 percent since 1996.

Mr. Miller. What is the mandatory portion? Where does that----

Mr. Skelly. It is two big pieces: Our student loan programs fluctuate with interest rates, and sometimes they actually go down. The chart you are looking at, it has a negative number in one year, and a couple of years later it is up \$6 billion. It goes up and down with interest rate assumptions and the amount we collect on student loans.

Mr. Miller. So it is mainly student loans.

Mr. Skelly. And Rehabilitation Services.

Mr. Miller. Still the increase is 25 percent in 2 years. So we have a big increase any way you want to measure it.

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISONS OF ACHIEVEMENT

Maybe some clarification on Mr. Wicker's question. When we start comparing ourselves with others, are we comparing apples to apples? What somebody has done to an analogous student population, we don't need to take time to talk about it now, but I am sure some analysis has been done, are we really getting comparable information?

CHARTER SCHOOLS

Let me ask you about the charter schools. Would you discuss what you are doing with charter schools, what the evaluation is, how the funding is and the results of funding the charter school situation?

Mr. Hansen. We have two primary components in our budget for charter schools this year. One is the grant program, which we are asking level funding for. This is an important priority for us. The evaluations that we are looking at are showing results, but I think that even when there is a news story about a charter school that has to be shut down or isn't achieving what it should, I think that is exactly what we need to be looking at from an education management standpoint. These schools need to produce or be held accountable.

And also, in Mr. Istook's question on the credit enhancement piece, we have found that the biggest impediment to the impact of the charter school movement is the infrastructure and construction and other needs that they have in financing

their capital needs. So that is really why our priority is in the \$100 million, that we hope to leverage to as much as a billion dollars in the marketplace in expanding the opportunities for charter schools.

Mr. Miller. I have seen some good charter schools in my area, so I am glad we are continuing along that line.

LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS

The quality of teachers, I see a couple of programs. There is a loan forgiveness program and the Troops to Teachers program and such. The loan forgiveness program--tell me about that.

Mr. Hansen. We feel this is a very important provision in our budget. Right now a graduate from college could have \$5,000 forgiven if they want to go into teaching in the areas of special education, math or science, in a low-income area. The average indebtedness for the average teacher is \$17,500, and that is the basis for our proposal to allow for a \$17,500 forgiveness program for those teachers. This is, as the Secretary mentioned earlier, in the area of math and science and in special education, to try to recruit the highest quality teachers to low-income areas, and these three fields is really where our priority is.

Mr. Miller. How long will they have to commit to teach?

Mr. Hansen. Five years.

Mr. Miller. One-fifth each year or total, have to stay 5-years?

Mr. Hansen. They would have it forgiven at the end of their 5-year time period. There is no deferment for the 5-year period, but they can get forbearance.

Mr. Miller. Thank you.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you.

Ms. DeLauro.

Ms. DeLauro. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary. Thank you. I have a little laryngitis, so I apologize for my voice.

Let me just say I think it is important to acknowledge somewhere that Department of Education, the program level increase, as I understand it, is \$1.4 billion. That is 3 percent excluding a \$1.3 billion proposed supplemental for Pell Grants. After accounting for inflation, in my view, the budget proposal doesn't demonstrate any real growth for education programs, and it is the smallest increase since fiscal year 1996. Let me just say that the average yearly growth in education during the previous 5 years has been about 13 percent. We are looking at growth here for 2003 at 2.8 percent. That is, if you will, cutting truly our investment in education by about, you know, 75 percent. And that is--I think we need to--have to take a look at it in that context.

HEAD START PROGRAM--DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Several questions which I will submit for the record have to do with TRIO and IDEA and some other pieces. Let me try to get in, if I can, three questions. One has to do with Head Start. When Secretary Thompson was here, I talked to him about

Head Start, the Administration's proposed move from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Education. I have a series of questions with regard to that.

Given the Administration's intent to move that program to the Department of Education, what do you say to those who believe that the program already places considerable attention on education needs of the children who participate? How can we ensure that the move will not undermine the goal of providing comprehensive services for low-income families with preschool-age children? Would the Department of Education be able to guarantee the essential program components such as comprehensive services, career development of community residents, extended day services to meet the needs of working parents, and will that be sustained? Why would you transfer this program to the Department of Education if, unlike HHS, the Department of Education has neither the record nor the structure to administer a program as large and as geographically spread out as Head Start? How can we guarantee moving this program to the Department of Education is truly not going to endanger the successful parental involvement component of the Head Start program?

Secretary Paige. Thank you. The President's interest in the Head Start program is to return it to its original focus, getting students ready to learn and to bridge the gap that occurs between the Head Start program and the traditional K-12 program. The whole point is we want students to be ready to learn when they get to first grade. So now we want to view that pipeline not starting at first grade, but starting much, much earlier. And the Administration is providing a lot of services through the Head Start program that we would like to improve, to include more literary readiness.

The decision has not been made to change the location of that program. Our major interest is in changing the focus, and we want to make sure that students are learning reading readiness.

Ms. DeLauro. First of all, I am delighted to hear there is no decision. You can look at the transcript for yourself. I think I would not be amiss if I said that I think Secretary Thompson, you know, maybe it is for turf reasons, but doesn't want to see the program moved. I think I said that when he was here. Clearly the public is not interested in that. But as I recall, Head Start and its inception--and we have got people like Ed Ziegler in New Haven and Jim Comer and a whole bunch of others who really talk about the ability for children to learn, and especially at the preschool level, it is about truly the engagement of a child, the engagement of kinds of social services, the engagement of parents and community that just truly are focused on child development. That way, when you focus on child development, that, in fact, you increase the ability of these youngsters to get the kind of literacy training and to move forward when you are trying to deal comprehensively with the whole child and their family instead of just focused on one narrow piece.

My time is going to--what I would do is love to have you, if you can, get for us some view about some of these things that literature shows from people like Comer and Ziegler and all of those folks who are engaged in trying to make sure our

kids are learning and learning as fast as they can, and what your views of that are in terms of where you want to go.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND OBESITY RATE FOR CHILDREN

If I can just sneak in a question, if I will, on physical fitness and obesity among children. The Surgeon General reports on obesity that 13 percent of children in this country are overweight. The percentage has tripled since 1980. Secretary Thompson testified before our subcommittee in March, this is a quote: I didn't realize this until I came out here, less than 25 percent of our schools have physical education programs anymore.

I think it is important for us to get the Education Department and education establishment to start reinstituting physical education classes. I met in my district with folks in my community who are interested in the juvenile diabetes effort, and not only parents came, but children; the whole critical part of the issue of diet, nutrition and how one could avoid the onset of juvenile diabetes by trying to control weight, activity, et cetera.

I will ask you if you agree with that assessment, that is what Secretary Thompson was talking about, and why should we support a proposal to terminate physical education for a program for which we provided \$50 million last year when both the Surgeon General and the Secretary of HHS tell us that obesity among children is a big problem? We are going to have problems with the onset of juvenile diabetes and the complications that result from that and have to deal with Federal dollars for that.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I apologize.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you.

Mr. Cunningham.

Secretary Paige. We agree with that.

Ms. DeLauro. Are you going to put back the program on physical education, which is now out of the budget? That is out of the budget, as I understand it. Maybe I am wrong.

Secretary Paige. We think those activities can be covered in other programs. We have zeroed that out because of the redundancy. We have other areas of the budget that provide dollars which can be used for that. It reflects the flexibility of H.R. 1, which provides for people at the local scene to make decisions about where they want these expenditures to go. So where they need support in the physical education program, there are sources of dollars.

Ms. DeLauro. I might add, Mr. Secretary, with all due respect, those programs are frozen. They are level-funded. And quite frankly, you are not going to convince me when you level-fund a program that it is not a cut in the program. So those dollars are diminished in this program. You are dealing with a lot of resources for other kinds of things, but you are also adding new burdens to already diminished resources.

Mrs. Northup. Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Cunningham. As a former coach I would work with the gentlelady on the program. I think it is important also.

Mr. Secretary, I want to thank you. You--unfortunately you have got to testify in an election year, and it is--sometimes it is a little difficult. But I want to compliment you on a

couple things I do know you are doing. Dr. Nancy Cunningham works for Bill Leidinger in the management system.

Secretary Paige. Great. Great.

DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT

Mr. Cunningham. What they are doing there, that department is going through and looking at the fraud, waste and abuse in the management of the system. For example, my colleagues probably don't know that under the Clinton Administration there were credit cards given to the Department of Education members, up to \$400,000 they could charge. A large number, and I mean a large number, exceeded the \$400,000 buying furniture and cars and private items and those kind of things. The Clinton Administration didn't have a Secretary at that level. It was a nonentity for oversight. And what Assistant Secretary Leidinger and his staff are doing is going through and making sure that that kind of fraud, waste and abuse doesn't exist.

The management team is also going through and looking, for example, at the Direct Loan program which had \$50 million they couldn't even account for in student loans, and then another \$12 million that went to the wrong students.

So when we are talking about Federal education funding, it is important to consider the increase in Federal dollars actually getting down to the classroom as a result of the increase in oversight, as well as the increase in what you are doing with the flexibility, the increase of local control, and the increase of funds not being wasted because of the fraud, waste and abuse within the Department of Education itself. And I don't think that we can lightly look over that. And I want to acknowledge it.

TITLE I--HOLD-HARMLESS PROVISION

Title I is very, very important in San Diego and in California. What was happening in the ``hold-harmless'' is many States were hanging on to those dollars, and we were actually receiving less dollars per child than other States because of the ``hold-harmless.'' I worked with Senator Dianne Feinstein on the committee and we were able to eliminate ``hold-harmless'' in FY 2002. So I just wanted to give you an idea that it is very, very critical.

SPECIAL EDUCATION FUNDS TO THE CLASSROOM

I also want to thank you for the increase in IDEA. But I also sit on the D.C. Subcommittee, which is not a fun committee most of the time, but I think we are doing a good job in the field of education for Washington, D.C. But under IDEA I imposed a cap on trial lawyers fees on IDEA funds. In one year we saved \$12 million which could be spent on student special instructors for the special needs children. Instead of \$12 million going to trial lawyers, it went to the IDEA program. When we increase those programs, we have these cottage organizations go up, and the systems are ripped off and I think hurting special education and public schools. I would like to work with you on some ability to limit those funds that go to

lawyers, and we want the funds getting down to the classroom.

PELL GRANT PROGRAM

The last thing I would like to talk about is the Pell Grant. There was language that we put in the FY 2002 Committee Report on setting up two pilot programs for year round Pell Grants. California is one of those areas that deal with rising student enrollments. You can provide for the record if you don't have it, but what are we doing with that language on those programs?

Secretary Paige. First of all, I want to thank you for noticing the work that is being done by Bill Leidinger in saving taxpayers' dollars and making sure we get those dollars where we want them to go, and that is to student achievement. As many as 11 or 12 people might have been indicted for some of the activity there.

Mr. Cunningham. I hope they are.

Secretary Paige. He's doing a wonderful job.

Mr. Hansen. We do appreciate the thoughts you have had. I think it is the year-round Pell and others that you have been talking about. We are right now just on the crest of starting our reauthorization process in higher education. We will be looking at all of these issues in terms of access and retention and how our Federal aid programs will reach people. So we will very much look at your ideas there, and we would love to work with you as we start our reauthorization development process on the Higher Education Act.

Mr. Cunningham. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you, Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Jackson. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, and thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your testimony.

TRIO PROGRAM

Mr. Secretary, I have just a couple of questions, the first of which concerns the TRIO program. As you well know, this is one of the more successful programs that this committee has funded in the past. Approximately 9.6 million low-income children are eligible for the program, but the program only actually reaches about 6 percent. I am wondering, do you believe that level funding is an adequate investment given that these programs have proven success records? And I share the same belief of Congresswoman DeLauro, that level funding in light of the need is the equivalent of a cut.

HISTORICALLY BLACK GRADUATE INSTITUTIONS

In the interest of time, Mr. Secretary, I am going to ask you the other two questions as well so that you will have adequate time to respond. Mr. Secretary, this subcommittee has a long history of supporting the Department's strengthening of our historically black graduate institution program. In the past two fiscal years, funding for this important program has increased from \$31 million to \$49 million. If we are going to continue to expand and enhance the quality of graduate programs

at our Nation's historically black colleges and universities, I believe that we must provide a more substantial increase in this area than the President proposed in fiscal year 2003. I would welcome the opportunity to work with you and to provide additional resources for this critical program above the \$1.8 million that the President has recommended in this area, and look forward to your comments on this matter.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the Congress conducted a major debate on elementary and secondary education in this country. HBCU's have historically played large roles in the educating and production of most of the black teachers in this country. We are seeing more diversity in our Nation's classrooms as the minority population increases. Because of HBCU's historical role in producing teachers that serve minority students, to what extent does the Administration plan to include HBCU's education in this debate?

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Secretary Paige. Thank you, Mr. Jackson, and thank you for your leadership, especially for HBCUs and children most in need.

TRIO PROGRAM

We agree completely that the TRIO program is a great program and that we wish we were in a position to increase the funding substantially. This budget was a tight budget year. What we were doing is making priority decisions. We felt that the priority would be Title I and the big dollar increase in Title I. Some of those dollars could have been put in other places, but we thought that beginning students, especially in reading and especially in the earlier grades, in preparing them, contributed as much toward their going to college as programs such as the TRIO program.

So we hope that we can arrive at a point soon where we can increase that funding, but because of other priorities, the increase that we have recommended for HBCUs is a 3.6 percent increase. We all agree that we would like to see it be a larger increase, but at this time, because of challenges in our economy and with the military, this is the increase that we are recommending to the Congress.

HBGIS AND HBCUS

Mr. Jackson. I had two other questions, Mr. Secretary, about working with you on the Department's strengthening of historically black graduate institution programs and on the black teachers initiative from the administration with respect to HBCUs.

Mr. Hansen. We do feel that increases will allow us to expand our efforts here. And we also are very fortunate to have Ambassador Leonard Spearman heading up our White House initiative on historically black colleges and universities. They had rechartered and had their last meeting last month, and we very much look forward to working with them and getting

their recommendations on how we can build upon the increase that we have this year and where our priorities should be in the years ahead. But it is a very great group of individuals of HBC presidents and individuals from the corporate world that will be bringing us their recommendations for the future as well as we go into next year.

Mr. Jackson. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you.

Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Welcome, Mr. Secretary.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PLAN

Last week the President announced his early childhood education plan called Good Start, Grow Smart. I applaud the President for his emphasis on education during the years from birth to 5. As the plan says, quote, there is a strong connection between the development a child undergoes early in life and the success that child will experience later in life. Of course, while strong cognitive development in the early years is an important predicate for later success in school, it is not the only predicate.

I would imagine you would agree that even a child with well-developed reading skills, which you emphasize repeatedly in your testimony today, will struggle in school if they are unable to follow directions or control their behavior or work with their peers. And for that reason the National Academy of Sciences reports, *Neurons to Neighborhoods*, recommended that resources on par with those being used on literacy and numerical skills also be devoted to emotional and social development. Cognitive development on the one hand and the social and emotional development on the other form the two pillars of school success.

So I would like to ask you, is it the position of your Department that the science on which *Neurons to Neighborhoods* is based is incorrect? Do you think the preliteracy skills are sufficient to ensure academic success regardless of an emotional or social development? And can we expect that the Administration's commitment to early learning programs will take another look at opportunities like the Foundations for Learning program to bolster the emotional and social development of vulnerable children? And I just would be interested in your response to that.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

As Mr. Jackson did, I would like to just ask my second question, which dovetails with this one. I am wondering, Mr. Secretary, given the fact that the Department is working to improve early intervention systems in States, do you think it would make sense to devise incentives to reward better performance by States in finding and serving disabled young children and their families?

And the point here is the infant and toddler program in part C of IDEA. This early intervention system at the State level gives thousands of children and families the critical services they need in order to get that early start, and as you

know, the allocation is based purely on population of children age 0 to 3 regardless of how narrow or broad the State's definition is.

So given all the science that we have on the brain development and the fact that 96 percent of the brain development occurs within the first 3 years of life, given the fact that you have just spoken about the importance of Title I as opposed to TRIO because you understand that it is important to get an earlier grab on these kids to make sure they get a good start, and given all of that and the President's emphasis on early literacy skills, can you comment on the Administration's position on coupling that early literacy skill promotion with the need to address the emotional/social development of those children, and, I might add, even their parents?

As Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro said, she talked about how Head Start addresses the parents' needs. And I would like you to incorporate that in your answer, because the fact of the matter is you can't address the kids' needs if the parents are totally dysfunctional, if they have mental health problems, if they are in the correctional system, or substance abuse problems. If these kids are coming from foster homes, you know, they are going to have problems. To ignore these problems in the context of the family and focus purely on the kids' cognitive development clearly ignores all the science that the Surgeon General has produced and that has come out in the last several years.

So I would ask you to, if you would, comment on the importance of putting more funding into the social and emotional development of children that are high-risk in the 0 to 6.

IMPORTANCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD INVESTMENT

And let me conclude, because my light is about to go up, that, you know, we spend approximately \$8,000 per child per year on a child from the first grade to 12. You appropriately said that learning begins a lot earlier than first grade. I applaud the Administration for that. I really do. I think they are absolutely on target, because the fact of the matter is a child is learning from birth. It is foolish for us to spend 8 grand a year on a child in elementary school, all through high school, and yet spend less than \$1,200 on a child from every year from 0 to 6. And these are the years where 96 percent to 100 percent of the brain development occurs. So have at it, Mr. Secretary.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

Secretary Paige. If I can remember, the first question you asked is if we would be willing to consider--are we concerned about the emotional and psychological development of children. The answer is very much so. That is why the President has recommended \$437 million for Special Education Grants for Infants and Families. In addition to that, we plan to get at that through professional development of teachers to be able to work with those kinds of challenges. Our Even Start program

takes families into consideration, because we agree with you that the child isolated from the family does not make sense in terms of development, so we have got to bring the family along. So I don't find much about your comments that I would disagree with at all.

Your other question, about do I think that incentives would be an important way to go--I think incentives always work well. I am very much a proponent of incentives.

SPECIAL EDUCATION--GRANTS FOR INFANTS AND FAMILIES

Mr. Kennedy. When you reauthorize IDEA, are you proposing that we spend more money on part C, the toddler and infant program? Would you see that as a good way to go?

Secretary Paige. I think that is something that we should consider. We can't commit now on exactly what we are going to do, because we are going to see what the President's Commission on Special Education has to say about those issues. But those are things that we are concerned about, yes.

EVEN START PROGRAM

Mr. Kennedy. Let me comment on the Even Start. As you know, there has been a cut, \$15 million, to the Even Start in the budget. But I would just add that in Rhode Island, Even Start is a very successful program. We are working to get money for them in our appropriations bill because they do such an effective job. I find that there is a waiting list for parents to try to get into English As a Second Language. And it is really a tragedy, in my mind, because these are all people who want to learn English, and we need to get them incorporated into our economy, and the first tool they need is to learn the literacy skills.

Even Start is being cut. As you know, the cuts have also been made in the Department of Labor for these programs. So it is hard for me to imagine we are going to get a good start if we are ignoring the needs of these at-risk families.

EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN

If you could comment on the emotional and social development, because I know you talked about professional development for teachers, and that is very important, and you talked about Even Start. But, you know, when it comes to these children, what are you doing on the emotional and social development for these children?

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SPECIAL EDUCATION

Secretary Paige. As I indicated, the emotional and social development of children is very much a concern of ours, and we will have a lot of interplay with that with the President's Commission on Special Education. We look forward to hearing some specific ideas that you have. We look forward to discussing that with you.

NCLB ACT--FOUNDATIONS FOR LEARNING

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you. We in this bill authorized--in the Leave No Child Behind Act authorized the Foundations for Learning section that focuses purely on those children that are at high risk because they come from these situations. Hopefully we can work with you to incorporate some funding within that program in the ultimate budget because we know that this is something that works. Your Administration has been focused on this, and it will be consistent with what you are trying to do to put some more money in this Foundation for Learning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula [presiding]. Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, welcome. I will try to ask a number of quick questions.

PROGRESS SINCE ``A NATION AT RISK'' REPORT

First of all, I presume you are familiar with The Nation at Risk, which was written in 1983.

Secretary Paige. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. Can you give me briefly your assessment--and obviously I don't want it in depth or I won't have any time left--as to how far we have come in the 22 years since The Nation at Risk was issued?

Secretary Paige. Yes. I think we have a Nation still at risk. We have made some progress, but not nearly enough. And I think we are specifically vulnerable in our math and science, in special education and early reading. We have islands of excellence across our Nation, but as a system we are still failing.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Secretary, I agree with you. After A Nation at Risk was recommended, in 1984, for the fiscal year 1984 budget, President Reagan recommended a 15 percent cut in the education budget, or thereabouts. I don't have the figure in front of me. That was not adopted, and we, as a matter of fact, increased the budget. Thereafter President Reagan was more supportive of education funding.

However, I think the point I make is that I think this committee is very concerned about the level of investment. This committee has supported substantially higher incremental increases, as you know, in education, and until such time, Mr. Secretary, as you can say and I can say with conviction that our Nation, the richest Nation on the face of God's earth, is no longer at risk of having mediocre education for any of our children--I applaud the President's leaving no child behind. This budget leaves children behind. That is my concern. I don't ask you comment on that because I don't think you could, but I make that observation, and we need to be energized about that.

FULL SERVICE SCHOOLS--JUDY CENTERS

Secondly, let me ask you something about--are you familiar with the concept of full service schools? Joy G. Dryfoos wrote a book about full-service schools, and we have Judy Centers in the State of Maryland. They are named after my wife.

Secretary Paige. I congratulate you on them.

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you.

I would like to have you, Mr. Secretary--matter of fact, I will invite you--there is a Judy Center not too far, about 20 minutes from here. I would like to invite you at some point in time to visit one of those because I want to pursue with you the way either the 21st Century Learning Centers which then Chairman, now Ranking Member, Obey was so involved in--to visit one of those because we need to fund a more comprehensive service at these incredible facilities we call schools, but which too frequently are used for too few activities.

Mr. Wicker. Might I suggest the entire subcommittee would be well served by---

Mr. Hoyer. I would love to have that. I will take you up on that suggestion. Mr. Secretary, if you would join us, we will set that up. It is an exciting concept.

Thank you, Roger.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

Mr. Secretary, let me ask you a third question. I am not sure the second was a question. The third question, though, is about teacher quality. If we are going to leave no child behind, you as a former superintendent know better than any other, the quality of a school system is judged by most parents by the quality of the educator in their child's classroom. Governor Hunt, as you perhaps know, was very involved in a program which I have been very supportive of, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which obviously aims to upgrade the quality and to give certification to teachers. This is a voluntary program, as you know, but that has been zero-funded. That gives me great concern. I will be trying to fund that at minimum last year's level, but could you comment on that, because I think that was one of the efforts that we were pursuing to ensure teacher quality in America. It is a relatively small program, if you don't know about it.

Secretary Paige. And I am very much aware of it. We zeroed it out because of that. It is a very small program, and we were concerned about the national impact. We just made priority decisions here. We had additional spending, we requested additional dollars, a 2.8 percent increase, but we made decisions about where those dollars would be, where they would have the greatest impact, the greatest national impact. This was a priority decision that we made.

BUDGET RESPONSE TO EVENTS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Secretary, let me make the observation that we came up with \$40 billion within a few days of September 11th. I think that was appropriate. I supported that. We did it because we were a Nation at risk. We were a Nation at risk of terrorism at that point in time. But the report of a Nation at Risk really premised--I hope I haven't gotten you in trouble, and they are calling to say, stonewall Hoyer, he is at it again. We all have that problem.

Secretary Paige. I apologize for that. I frequently forget to turn this doggone thing [cell phone] off.

Mr. Hoyer. The good news is the President is not here. I understand he gets very upset about that.

Mr. Secretary, the point I was making when the President called was that if we are a Nation at risk as we were when we came up with \$40 billion, we are going to come up with other billions to respond to an external threat.

Secretary Paige. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. A Nation at Risk's premise was that we were equally at risk of undermining the health of our Nation internally by producing mediocre or less than mediocre children. The President is absolutely correct, we ought to leave no child behind. This \$10 billion that you zero-funded tries to ensure that we have quality teachers around the country.

I understand what you are saying, we make choices. What I am saying is we are going to come up with the President wants \$10 billion at the Department of Defense with having no purpose for it at this point in time and no oversight by the Congress of it, \$10 billion, not 10 million, and that is what gives me great concern, Mr. Secretary. And we need a Secretary of Education--I know you have been a great educator. I have great respect for your background. I don't know you personally, but you have done an extraordinary job--but we need a Secretary of Education energized about the children that are being left behind. It is not enough, Mr. Secretary, to rhetorically say we are going to leave no child behind. We must not leave any child behind. That is what that--I am a big proponent of this program because I think it focuses on the quality of the teacher. If you don't have a quality teacher, you don't have a good educational system. I don't care how good it looks at the top.

FY 2003 BUDGET REQUEST--FUNDING FOR TEACHER QUALITY

Secretary Paige. Let me comment on that because I can't find any point of disagreement about needing a quality teacher. We clearly need a quality teacher. But where I have the difficulty is the assumption that if we spend more, we achieve more. I have 7 years of experience that says that is not true. And I think the Nation has decades of experience to say that is not true. When we spend more, that doesn't automatically produce more.

IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY STATE GRANTS

So, you can take individual parts of this budget and pull them out and say that that is here or it is not here, but the overall budget is committed to the premise that no child is left behind. I am completely--I have complete faith in that. For example, your example about teachers, there is \$2.85 billion in here for Improving Teacher Quality. There are wonderful ideas about how we can improve teacher quality, and also the program contains the amount of flexibility allowing the people at the local scene to decide upon the kind of training and the kind of recruitment methods they want, and even to buy additional staff development from external sources. They have the flexibility to do that. So inside of this \$2.85 billion, individual States or individual school districts who want to participate in a national certification program can do that. So the premise that it is absent because it doesn't have

a name written in the budget doesn't hold.

It is a conceptual difference. If we take each individual program and say we didn't fund this individual program, you deny us the opportunity to change things. That is a prescription for continuing to do things as we have always done it, and we represent change.

WEIGHING AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT WITH RESULTS

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Secretary, my time is obviously up. I understand your premise in that answer. I want to, with all due respect, say we have heard--it is a good answer, and it is an accurate answer in many respects, but it is also an answer which fails to come to grips specifically with a program in existence that I think is working very well. Yes, it is \$2.85 billion that you have recommended. That is \$400 million less than the Congress decided was the authorized level that ought to be passed of \$3.2 billion. Now that may be--your judgment may be better than the Congress's judgment. The \$3.2 billion was the proper level; \$2.8 billion may be the proper level. I agree with that, it is results we want to look at. I am for change. It is particularly change that will bring us better education.

Mr. Secretary, I would be enthusiastic about looking at your testimony as superintendent of the Houston schools where you testified if you just give us a little less money, we could do a better job. Perhaps you would send me a copy of that testimony.

Secretary Paige. I would like to comment on that. I open myself for you to check the records. First thing I did is pledge not to increase taxes and not to ask for additional resources, and I found there were ways inside the system to reallocate dollars and expend more. I would personally hope that you look into our record of efficient operations in Houston.

Mr. Hoyer. We will try to pursue your hope.

Mr. Regula. You want to go to Houston now.

Mr. Hoyer. We will start a Judy Center in Houston, Mr. Chairman. Sounds good to me. We will reallocate some money in Houston to do that.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Sherwood.

Mr. Sherwood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SCHOOL EXCELLENCE A PRODUCT OF MANAGEMENT

Welcome, Secretary Paige. There are so many things that have been said today that I would like to comment on. I would like to start with Mr. Hoyer's thought that every parent thinks their school is good or bad depending on a given classroom teacher. I agree with that. When I was the president of the school board in Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, the first day of the year I told the teachers they have the future in our hands. When they went there and closed the door, they were in control of their world. What they did was up to them. But what always disturbs me is the worst teacher in the school is paid exactly the same as the best teacher in the school. We have so many institutional prohibitions against excellence and towards

mediocrity that it makes it hard to handle. I am very interested in your chart, and I agree with that.

Mr. Hoyer. Will the gentleman yield? To that extent, Mr. Obey observed it is sort of like the congressional pay system.

Mr. Sherwood. Well, I think Mr. Obey has a correct observation. But I would also submit that probably what the teachers do is often more important than what we do. But I think we have to look at the institutional barriers to excellence, and your chart on the wall shows me something, and my 20 years of experience as a school board member is not near as pertinent as yours, but each school district rises and falls on who the board hires for their superintendent. But it has been my experience that excellence doesn't come necessarily from spending more money, it comes from better management--- Secretary Paige. That is right.

SPECIAL EDUCATION BUDGET INCREASE

Mr. Sherwood. The Federal share of a school district's budget is very, very small. As I remember, ours was about 8 percent, the Federal share. In that regard, though, one of the things that I thought caused us the most angst was deciding how we would allocate our resources to take care of special education mandates and how it was being fair to the kids with special needs as opposed to the great majority of the school population.

So I commend you for your \$1 billion increase for special education grants to the States, because that is the one place that I think the Federal Government has some responsibility. When they mandate something, then they have to help fund it.

FEDERAL ROLE VERSUS LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

I really believe that the Federal Government's role, and I would like your comment on this, is to encourage excellence and to set standards and to set a national tone where communities expect more from their schools. I don't think those schools can be run by your office or by the Congress, but we can certainly do a lot of things to help.

Secretary Paige. That is right. We completely agree with that. That is exactly our view. We are going about the Nation now making that point exactly because we want parents and the people at the local scene to be more involved in making the decisions that are made in order to improve schooling. It cannot be done in their absence.

TEACHER PAY

Mr. Sherwood. Would you like to comment on my statement that the worst teacher in the school and the best teacher in the school with equal education and equal time in service are paid the same?

Secretary Paige. I would be eager to comment on that. I don't think that there is any enterprise in the history of civilization that, if we expect to improve it, would operate with policies like that. That the worst teachers and best teachers are paid the same, no linkage at all between

contribution and compensation, that is a prescription for difficulties, and yet we know that teachers are underpaid. It is a problem that teachers are underpaid. That problem is going to persist as long as we use those kinds of principles to underpin the compensation system.

Also the supply and demand issue. We pretend that every one of these specialty areas has the exact same supply and demand situation, and that is not the case. We can't find math and science teachers and special education teachers and teachers with language skills, yet there are many other disciplines and courses that teachers teach and you can find them; you go to the personnel office for teachers, you find just boatloads of them. What is the logic of paying them the same; it's as if we are saying that the law of supply and demand doesn't work in our business?

So those are the kinds of things that we think offer us opportunity to improve the system. Just putting additional dollars on top of it will not get us there. We have decades of proof of that fact.

ADMINISTRATOR PAY AND TEACHER RETENTION

Mr. Sherwood. We also make it difficult for people to be administrators because the pay differential between teachers with experience and administrators with experience in many areas is so minuscule that it is hard too find really good people that want to work 12 months a year instead of 9 months a year for the difference in the pay. But it is management, as you well know as a superintendent, every time you hire a mediocre teacher, they will be with you until they retire. And if you work hard to hire the best you can find, they might move on because they might be an administrator, go do something else someday, but at least you had the best for a while, and that is what the kids deserve.

And I would also like to comment, if I might, that the more we separate politics from education, the further ahead we will get.

Secretary Paige. Your comments are very reflective of your experience as a school board member. I can understand where you get those thoughts. I, too, was a school board member. I agree with you completely.

TEACHERS FOR NON-ENGLISH SPEAKERS

Mr. Sherwood. One other thing my rural school districts wanted me to mention, they have been hit pretty hard by the new English secondary language requirement. In districts where it is a very homogeneous English-speaking population, I have a couple small districts that plan to restrict their future Rotary exchange students to English-speaking so they don't have to hire a new teacher that they can't afford. That might be something we could take a look at.

Secretary Paige. Yes.

Mr. Sherwood. Thank you very much.

MERIT-BASED AND DIFFERENTIAL PAY FOR TEACHERS

Mr. Hoyer. Could I add a point? I think Mr. Sherwood has made a very important point, and staff--I wouldn't have known this off the top of my head, but the staff points out to me that in the bill we just passed, that one of the items under subpart 1 states activities which the Federal Government can help fund are developing or assisting an LEA in developing merit-based performance systems and differential and bonus pay for teachers in high-need academic subjects. So that speaks to the differential for quality teachers. I tend to agree--don't tend, I agree with the gentleman.

Secretary Paige. That is what ESEA Title II--Improving Teacher Quality State Grants--is all about. There's about \$2.85 billion there.

Mr. Regula. I want to go back to Mr. Obey.

Mr. Hoyer. But there is no more than that. That is what it is all about, but it costs money to do that.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Mr. Regula. Question: One of the gratifying things to me of this hearing has been almost every Member and, of course, you, Mr. Secretary, have emphasized teacher quality. That is the key to the school system performing well on behalf of the students. Just as a follow-up, are you looking at all at certification standards? We have 50 States. Every State does its own certification; therefore, there is probably a lot of lack of uniformity on certification standards.

And secondly, are you looking at the colleges of education? I have a strong suspicion that quality of teachers coming out varies greatly depending on the emphasis that the given college or university makes on their education wing.

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Secretary Paige. The college of education offers us a vast opportunity, big opportunity to improve. We have had a lot of interaction with the colleges of education. We have spoken to ACTE, which is the organization that accredits the college of education. We have spoken to the presidents of universities. There are a lot of opportunities there; for example, the university using the college of education as a cash cow, taking the tuition generated from them to fund other parts of the university that don't produce quite as much revenue in terms of a credit-hour generation; the quality of the research that comes out of the colleges because they are not supported strongly with graduate assistance and innovative dollars, and things like that, like some of the other parts of the universities--according the university more prestige--are supported. So there are a lot of opportunities there for improvement.

Mr. Regula. Well, Mr. Secretary, we welcome any suggestions from your Department as to how we might, using the resources of this bill, add incentives for better education programs in our colleges and universities, because I think it is a potentially weak link in all of this.

Mr. Obey.

Mr. Obey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I will know that your agency is getting enough money when the charts that you present are as expensive and fancy as the Pentagon's. You have a long way to go.

Secretary Paige. I don't know. You might not have seen some of our most recent stuff.

ADEQUACY OF FY 2003 BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. Obey. I think that chart is essentially misleading because it does not take into account enrollment growth. It does not take into account the fact that today you have many more low-income and minority students participating in these tests. And it also, I think, doesn't reflect the fact that Title I has never been fully funded. In fact, it has never even come close to laying a glove on the real problem.

As far as I am concerned, the great scandal in American public life is the fact that the political system hasn't had the guts and the wisdom to do a heck of a lot more to equalize the resources available from one district to another. Dollars may not alone determine the outcome, but I know that a kid in Maple Bluff with three times the tax base as a kid from Maple in my State is going to get a better education because they have a whole lot more money to spend. I usually quote Archie the Cockroach, who is my favorite philosopher, but instead today I want to quote Paddy Ashdown, who used to be the head of the Liberal Party in Britain. Ashdown said in his farewell speech before he left the Parliament, ``All too often the passion of our words stands in stark contrast to the puniness of our commitments,' ' and I think really that is what we are talking about today when we look at this budget.

TEACHER QUALITY

I just want to walk through why I say that. This bill is \$7.2 billion short of the authorization which was trumpeted just 3 or 4 months ago. This budget freezes Teacher Quality State Grants, and it cuts funding for teacher quality programs in total by \$163 million.

I asked earlier how much it would cost us to provide every teacher with the qualifications that H.R. 1 demands of them by a scheduled date, and what it would cost to provide that additional education and training. We don't have an answer, but you can bet it is going to be a lot. This budget doesn't respond to that. In fact, coming from a rural area, as I do, I note that the rural education initiative is zeroed out. That is \$163 million less available.

CIVICS EDUCATION

Civics education--most high school kids are illiterate when it comes to understanding how their government works. In a recent study, only 4 percent of those students measured up to the excellence category, and only 25 percent of them achieved better than a functionally literate level in terms of understanding how our government works. Yet you zero out this small program to deal with this problem.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRAINING

Every national security agency I have talked to has talked about the need to have a much greater emphasis upon foreign language training in this country. You eliminate the foreign language program for K through 12 students, despite the fact that last year before this committee you said, ``we need to give students an international education that meets the highest standards.'' The Federal Government is going to contribute precious little to doing that if we are eliminating this program.

SECONDARY EDUCATION

On TV we have a program called The Weakest Link. In my view, the weakest link in the American education system is the American high school. If you take a look at the 12 programs in the budget that focus essentially on secondary education, you freeze 7 of them, you cut one by 50 percent, and you eliminate 4 of them. There is no boost to TRIO or GEAR UP. You eliminate the smaller schools initiative despite the fact that there are 600 applications at the Federal level.

You are only funding one-third of those applications. Bill Gates, foundation alone will spend more this year to help local school districts downsize oversized bloated high schools than the Federal Government will, and I think that is incredible. H.R. 1 includes a whole series of mandates on standards, on assessment, on curriculum, and on teacher qualifications. And yet this bill is \$7.2 billion short of the authorization that was trumpeted in order to help meet those problems. The rate of new investment in education is cut by over 75 percent from last year to this year.

EDUCATION MANDATES

If you compare those program cuts with the mandates, the after-school program, you freeze. The literacy through library program, you freeze. Dropout prevention, you eliminate. The education for homeless program is frozen. The State grants for teacher quality, frozen. Comprehensive school reform cut by \$75 million. The smaller high school initiative, you eliminate. Rural education is eliminated. Then we get to the adequacy of Title 1. Title 1 is \$4.6 billion below the authorization. It is \$28 billion below what would be full funding, so that all eligible kids could actually get some benefit from it. One half of the schools with poverty enrollments between 50 and 75 percent get no Title 1 money whatsoever--6,000 schools in this country. Only 15 percent of Title 1 money goes to middle or high schools, and yet they contain 33 percent of the low-income kids in the country.

STATE STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

If you take a look at mandated assessments, the GAO says that only 17 States have met current standards. You have got a lot of States right now applying for waivers so that they can get 10 years to comply with the existing standards.

Secretary Paige. By standards, you mean the 1994 standards?

Mr. Obey. Yes.

Secretary Paige. That is not true.

Mr. Obey. The General Accounting Office says that, and so if you have a disagreement, I would be happy to know what your response is. But the General Accounting Office, which is the agency that we rely on, says that only 17 States are in compliance.

Secretary Paige. That may be dated information. That might have been true when they said it. My statement is, it is not true now.

Mr. Obey. They just released it.

Secretary Paige. Well, I don't know what date that is, but I can tell you that is not true.

Mr. Obey. Well, I would be happy to hear any comments you have for the record, but until I see otherwise, I will stick with the GAO report. And yet, given the fact that only 17 States comply with the 1994 standards, we are now laying out a whole new level of standards. In Wisconsin, for instance, right now we provide reading and math tests for grades 4, 8 and the tenth grade. You have got new assessment requirements for the 3, 5, 6, and 7 grades. That adds \$8 million to Wisconsin's cost alone. The annual cost of test administration in my own State is about \$12 million according to State officials. They have been getting \$7 million in fiscal year 2002. Under your budget request, they get \$193,000 more. That is a small item, but given the fact that State governments' revenue bases are crashing all around the country, this budget is pitiful in terms of its response to the realities that have changed massively since last August when this budget was put together.

So, Mr. Secretary, I have great respect for you. I do not expect you to perform miracles, but I think this budget is a tremendous nonresponse to the biggest domestic challenge of our time.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Wicker to close.

Mr. Wicker. Thank you very much and, Mr. Secretary, this has been a good hearing. I think it has been probably a pretty accurate preview of the debate that we will have, and I look forward to it.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

One thing that we have not talked about today that I want to bring up just as an inoculation is school construction. I am pleased that the No Child Left Behind Act and the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bill did not contain any appropriation for funding for school construction, and I think this recognizes that this is an item best left to the local school districts. I just want to point out that this is something we have talked about in years past. We have had a heated debate about it, but in my opinion, school construction at the Federal level creates an expectation that we are going to do a whole lot more of that in the future. You have been very firm about this, pointing out that a Federal school construction program would remove incentives for local communities to make that commitment and offer bond issues and other revenue-generating devices, and then once a school construction program is begun, where does it

end? Are we building schools in every school district, in every congressional district, not to mention the Davis-Bacon issues that it adds?

I just hope that the Administration and the President are resolute on this issue. It is bound to come up again in the future, and I just would ask you, are you going to stay firm on this issue when it eventually does raise its head again?

Secretary Paige. We are committed to that.

Mr. Wicker. Very good. Let me ask two other things.

PARAPROFESSIONAL TEACHERS

One, assistant teachers. I am asking this question on behalf of a number of assistant teachers in my congressional district who have approached me on this issue, and basically they have been told that for the modest sum of money they are receiving as compensation, they are going to have to go back to community college and get a 2-year degree, or they are not going to be able to continue on as assistant teachers, because of the No Child Left Behind Act. Now I am aware that there is flexibility in the act. There is a 4-year grandfather clause, and there is the opportunity rather than going back to the community college and getting the associate degree or passing a competency exam. I think some of the States do not want to develop their own competency exam, but at any rate, I can tell you that out there in at least a part of the hinterlands, Mr. Secretary, there are some assistant teachers who think they have got to go back to college so they can earn basically \$9-10,000 a year and they are not going to do it.

The question I have, is there is flexibility there, and there is flexibility all throughout the act. Do you think we are doing a good job communicating that aspect of the bill to the local districts and also to the---

Mr. Regula. Keep it short because we are running out of voting time.

Mr. Wicker. And I will be glad to take the chair, Mr. Chairman, into the hearing, because I have one other thing that---

Mr. Kennedy. And I would like to get a question in before Mr. Wicker gets through his---

Mr. Regula. I might say we will have a number of your deputies here tomorrow so there will be an opportunity---

Mr. Kennedy. I would like to make a comment, because I think it is---

Mr. Regula. Well---

Mr. Wicker. I will be glad to take the chair, Mr. Chairman, and I will ensure that I get there for the vote, and Mr. Kennedy also.

Mr. Regula. All right. You have made a proposal. I will accept it.

Mr. Wicker. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Secretary.

MANDATE FOR A QUALIFIED TEACHER IN EVERY CLASSROOM

Mr. Wicker [presiding]. Would you care to comment with regard to the flexibility and also if you want to address the

assistant teacher question.

Secretary Paige. Legislation requires that there be after a specific date, a qualified teacher in every classroom, and we have not yet finished defining a qualified teacher in every classroom, and so there is a lot of reaction across the Nation to this, and some are making assumptions that are not going to materialize. So we are going to push as soon as we can to get that correct information out so people can make the right judgments.

We are also going to be using the flexibility that we have.

JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

Mr. Wicker. Okay. And then just one other thing, and perhaps you will have to answer this on the record. I visited your alma mater, Jackson State University, the other day. Dr. Ron Mason, the president there of less than 2 years, is doing a wonderful job. He has a program where through a cooperative agreement, the university has adopted several local elementary schools. They have not been forced to do this by the State. As far as I know, there is no Federal program to facilitate this or require it or encourage it, but I just wonder if you could provide the subcommittee any information the Department has about the education schools at our universities and what they could accomplish by adopting a marginal or less-than-ideal school within the shadow of their very infrastructure, because I think it is a wonderful thing, and we ought to call on all of our great universities to do that very thing.

Secretary Paige. Yes. We have some comments, quick comments about that.

Mr. Hansen. We will, and I think we have actually looked very closely at what they are doing and I think we will be able to either replicate it or work through some of our programs to try to expand what they are doing.

Secretary Paige. In fact, we are assisting Jackson State with that concept now.

Mr. Wicker. Very good. If you will provide the subcommittee on the record with information about the manner which you are facilitating them.

[The information follows:]

Jackson State University

The Department awarded a grant in fiscal year 2001 to Jackson State University to assist Jackson State in working in partnership with the Jackson Public School District to enhance student achievement in reading, mathematics, and other subject areas. The project, which is using a professional development school framework, will include key stakeholders in the community, including the university, schools, parents, teachers, administrators, and policy-makers. One goal of the project is to unify all partner efforts under one umbrella to ensure mutual goal attainment and improve relationships among partners. The plan is for the partnership to help to inform decisions about the teacher preparation curriculum, the school curriculum, and professional development.

EVEN START AND ADULT LITERACY PROGRAMS

Mr. Wicker. Now, Mr. Kennedy, how many minutes do you need, one or two?

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, I just have two comments I want to make real quick. When, Mr. Secretary, you mentioned Even Start as an answer to my first question about early literacy, I said that the cut was \$15 million. I found out from my staff I was being generous to you. The cut is actually \$50 million in the Administration's budget, down to \$200 million. And adult basic education is frozen at \$575 million. I do appreciate the fact that you recognize that adult literacy is crucial to children's literacy, but as you know, in a recent educational testing service internationally, the United States ranks 10th out of 17 industrial nations for the amount of investment we are making in adult literacy. In my State of Rhode Island, we have over 370,000 people in a State of less than a million who are unable and have difficulty performing basic tasks such as reading a utility bill or writing a letter or understanding a map. So according to the National Council of State Directors of Adult Literacy, there are 12 million adults who are in need of essential services, and yet our current funding level only allows us to serve 3 million.

FAMILY LITERACY

So I want to make those comments, and maybe you or your staff could get back to me at some point about what we are going to do to work on them, because I think they go hand in hand with the original questions that I was asking about family literacy, because how is a child going to learn if their parents are unable to even have the most basic literacy? And we know that Even Start does work, as you have said, yet I don't think we are doing enough to ensure that the first teacher the child has, which is the parent, gets the skills that they need as well. And that is why I was asking about ESL.

Secretary Paige. We will respond for the record if that is your request.

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

COMMITTEE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Wicker. Thank you very much and thank you for your indulgence and a fine hearing, and we are adjourned.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Thursday, April 11, 2002.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WITNESSES

EUGENE W. HICKOK, UNDER SECRETARY
SUSAN B. NEUMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION

Introduction of Witnesses

Mr. Regula. Well, we will get started. I think we have an extremely important message to cover.

I might draw your attention to that painting over there. That is where it all started. I live on a farm. That schoolhouse is right at the end of my lane. It is not on my property; it is on my neighbor's property. Her great grandfather gave the land to the school district, but never gave the deed. So when the school was abandoned, it was still on his land, and it has come down to the heirs.

The farm is still in the same family. But the woman who lived up the road, and who had ownership, went 8 years there to school, so she had a very sentimental attachment to it. She had it restored, all the brick work and so on. It is in beautiful condition. You could put a few desks in there and open up and have school.

I have to tell you that if my three children could have gone there for 8 years with a good teacher, I would have been very happy. Because it had eight grades, students heard the material eight times; and those country schools weren't all bad.

It is interesting that the Gates Foundation has embarked on a crusade, using their resources to get schools to reduce sizes, particularly in high schools, with 600 students being the optimum. I think there is a movement in this country, and certainly it is happening in my district, where they are trying to reduce the size of schools. And there is some merit for young people having a sense of belonging, which with 2,000 or 3,000 in a high school, it is pretty hard to do. How things change.

And of course we are dealing with elementary education this morning. I might tell you I was an elementary principal. I went to law school at night, but for 7 years I was in public education, taught seventh graders and eighth graders. For 3 years I had a combined seventh and eighth, all subjects. I was the principal and also the coach and occasionally drove the bus. It was a small rural school.

Then I graduated to a 20-room school. But what I did, when I had a teacher that was ill, I did substituting. So I had every grade, and I concluded that the lower the grade, the more I would pay the teacher, because the challenges are so great. You cannot give first graders busy work.

So I think those elementary years are absolutely the most important years because you shape the attitude of young people.

One of the things the Gates Foundation is doing--and they announced it in my district about a month ago--is, in Ohio, they have committed \$25 million, the Ford Foundation, \$5 million, and the Knowledge Works Foundation, \$1.5; and it is

going to the State Department of Education, and schools will apply for grants to deal with the dropout rate. Our urban cities in Ohio have about a 50 percent dropout rate.

A lot of those attitudes get shaped in those early years and they become important. Mr. Hoyer, what is your experience in Maryland on the dropout rates, the high school dropouts?

Mr. Hoyer. Well, it is regional, some areas obviously where it is pretty high. Prince George's County has a higher percentage. I don't know the exact percentages, but Prince George's County obviously has a higher percentage than Montgomery County because of the economic makeup of the constituency, cohorts in the school system. It is too high.

Mr. Regula. Well, the Gates Foundation is making a national commitment of money to try to deal with the problem of dropouts in high schools because there is an enormous loss of human capital. Our attorney general in Ohio is doing research and discovering that a lot of young people who are involved in crime are dropouts--sort of goes together.

Mr. Hoyer. Sure.

Mr. Regula. Well, so much for our----

Mr. Hoyer. Musings.

Mr. Regula [continuing]. Little sermon. Musings, yes.

Mr. Hickok. Preaching to the choir.

Mr. Regula. Yes.

Well, we are happy to welcome you. Your testimony will be put in the record. You may summarize as you choose and we will go from there.

Opening Statement

Mr. Hickok. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Since you mentioned the painting of the school, I might mention as I start that if you drive by the Department of Education just down the street from here, you will see that because we have some work being done on the outside of the building, they built some protective enclosures so people who enter the building are protected; and we decided to make them look like a one-room schoolhouse, a little red schoolhouse, in honor of the importance that everyone places on education.

So I encourage you to drive by and take a look. It might warm your heart a bit and remind you of your own schoolhouse on your own property.

I do appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before the committee to talk about the implementation of No Child Left Behind. I will ask the committee to take my entire statement for the record. The most important thing I want to say, really, is that everyone here knows, with the bipartisan support of Congress, we consider this to be the most comprehensive change in Federal education policy since the Federal Government got engaged in education policy in the 1960s. It is based on four principles, or four pillars, familiar to everyone here I am sure: increased accountability for results, increased opportunities for flexibility at the State and local level, increased options for parents, and scientifically based research and evidence-based policy.

Those four principles underwrite No Child Left Behind, underwrite Secretary Paige's approach to education generally,

and the President's philosophy of education. And if you look at No Child Left Behind, I think it is the evidence of those four principles throughout.

With me is Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education, Susan Neuman. Susan is really the one primarily responsible for much of the implementation of the details of this new law. My job as Under Secretary is to work with her and Secretary Paige and the President on implementation as well.

Having said that, we also have members of the budget staff here, obviously to talk about the budget, current and future, with regard to implementation. Other than that, I guess I will forgo any more commentary and welcome the conversation. Thank you very much.

[The statement of Mr. Hickok follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Thank you. Speaking of substitutes, maybe we ought to have a program that when they need a substitute teacher in D.C., we call on the Department of Education to provide one.

Mr. Hickok. I am not sure I would endorse that idea. Just don't call on me. I might say that anyway.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

Mr. Regula. Well, that is the real world. You say it is a revolutionary change. What is going to change?

Let's go to elementary school aid in the 16th district. What will be different as a result of this act? How will it improve the experience of a child in that school?

Mr. Hickok. Well, when it is fully implemented, I think the most important thing I would say would be this:

The context in which parents and teachers and administrators and, ultimately, students approach education will be in a broader context in looking at the performance and results from the earliest years on, so that for the first time in this country, you will have more of an educational bottom line. Because of the accountability provisions, for example, we will have a better sense of how well students are doing in reading, math, and science in a way that is understandable to parents.

Right now, a lot of testing goes on, but I have been surprised about the degree to which nothing is done with the tests in terms of helping to guide pedagogy, guide instruction, helping to make sure it is a tool to improve education as opposed to just a test. And that is what accountability is all about. It is not accountability just to take tests. It is about improving instruction and improving curriculum. So that is a big part of it.

I think also as we develop more evidence of what works, which is a very important part of this policy, we will be seeing students benefit at earlier ages because we will see instruction that is based upon sound evidence of what works.

We know that happens in reading now. We know what works in

reading. And Susan is a national expert on reading, so maybe she will talk about this. But we also know that in far too many places we are not doing what we know works as we teach reading, in part because teachers don't know it, in part because there are lots of different approaches out there that sound good, but don't have sound policy behind them.

When we start teaching based upon sound evidence in reading and in math and other disciplines, down the road I think we will see students benefit tremendously.

Everyone agrees how important it is in the earliest years to have sound instruction in reading and math, but as our scores show us, in far too many places good intentions are not followed with good results. So I think down the road, with the law fully implemented, we as a Nation will have a better sense of results that we can measure. And when we see problems, it will be more difficult to close our eyes to them.

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Regula. How do you address this problem? You are letting each State develop its own test. Now, one State may have a much lower criterion for their testing program than another State, and yet theoretically this is a national program and it is designed to get results across the board. How can you have 50 different sets of tests and accomplish that?

Mr. Hickok. Well, you are right, the law calls for each State to develop its own accountability system using State academic content and standards and then looking at assessments that would be keyed to those standards. And you are right, there is a possibility of 50 different accountability systems and some being relatively low in terms of measurement and some being much higher.

Two things I would say will help define that field. One is, the law also calls for NAEP, the National Assessment of Education Progress, to be administered and for every State to participate. And so that provides somewhat of a benchmark. I will use my home State of Pennsylvania where I was State chief for 6 years. For example, if Pennsylvania ends up setting its levels too low, every time Pennsylvania runs up against NAEP, if NAEP is much higher or much lower, there is a disconnect.

Mr. Regula. That is a universal test, NAEP?

Mr. Hickok. It is an assessment sample. Every State will do it, but it is a sample of student performance. It is not a universal test in every State, but it will be a benchmark for States to compare.

In addition, because every State and district will do report cards, it will be much easier for a parent to pull down the report card off the web of, say, Pennsylvania and look at Pennsylvania's performance on its assessments, how it compares on NAEP and how it might compare to other States in terms of where they are both as a State and on NAEP. So that context of comparability will make it, we think, a little bit more difficult to game the system. We think some gaming will go on, but overall, I think, as parents and policymakers, as taxpayers, we will get a better sense of where a State is, and it will be difficult for a State to continue to be a low performer.

Mr. Regula. You are assuming that the parents will bring in the accountability factor because they are the ones that would have to rely on the measuring standards as to whether or not their children are getting a good education. Who else is going to enforce accountability?

Mr. Hickok. Well, certainly we are. That is our primary responsibility.

Mr. Regula. By withholding money?

Mr. Hickok. If we have to.

Ms. Neuman. Not only that.

Mr. Hickok. A couple of things. One is to make sure that at a national level there are such things as what we have been doing the last couple of days with rallies to encourage parents to understand the law, to get them engaged, with more information so parents understand.

We think parents are always going to--as Secretary Paige said yesterday--parents are always going to be the most important factor in a child's education. But accountability for results talks about making sure policymakers at the local level--school boards, State legislators, Members of Congress, the Department of Education--have a way of demonstrating where States are with regard to compliance with the law as well as accountability.

Mr. Regula. I yield to the gentlewoman from Kentucky.

KENTUCKY'S TESTING SYSTEM

Mrs. Northup. I think the example in Kentucky is probably one of the best and is something to point out.

In 1990, we went to an outcome-based program, where schools got all their money and basically took a State test. In the beginning, the State-developed test might have been reliable, but it didn't take long for the people that developed it to figure out that the State was paying the bill, and if they didn't like the results, they might go somewhere else. So they started making this test easier and easier.

What happened, though, is the NAEP--which is like an audit that a few children in every school take--the NAEP tests showed that we didn't improve. And the minute the newspapers got ahold of that, almost overnight the Kentucky test was scrapped. You can make up your own test, but if it is not valid, it will show up that your kids have a flat line on the NAEP. Never mind what they are doing on the State test.

So overnight the legislators, the parents, and the newspapers reacted--I mean, it was a front page newspaper story--and the test got scrapped. It is that sort of transparency that holds them accountable.

Mr. Regula. So you think there was a discipline in the system?

Mrs. Northup. Oh, I do. I think the NAEP test basically says you can establish the criteria.

In Kentucky, we added a lot of decision-making--creating a more-difficult-to-measure assessment. This made it a more subjective test.

But the NAEP asks, ``can you read?'' And the fact is, they couldn't read any better after 6 years than they could when they started; and that is what precipitated the throwing out of

the test. They now have a much more reliable test that reflects the same results as the NAEP test.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Hoyer.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First, let me say I think everybody on this side of the aisle is clearly supportive of--and of course this bill, as you know, may have been the most bipartisan bill that has passed; and frankly, from our perspective, one of the few bills that was worked on in a bipartisan fashion. And I think the four criteria you set forth in your statement we all agree with.

I want to ask you a question that is a follow-up to my question to Secretary Paige yesterday. A Nation At Risk was issued in 1983. Secretary Bell was the Secretary of Education, as you will recall, and of course it said we were at risk of becoming a nation of mediocrity. I asked Secretary Paige what progress he thought we had made; and essentially I think what he said is--and I am characterizing his remarks--we have made some progress, but we still are a nation at risk. I think that is a fair characterization.

Now, if that is the case, the general question I want to ask you in the context of this bill, the No Child Left Behind bill--which all of us obviously agree with, rhetorically at least--are we in your judgment making the investment that is necessary to both implement the bill and to accomplish the objective of not being a nation at risk, of having children in mediocre educational settings?

Mr. Hickok. In my opinion, the answer to both those questions is yes. And let me provide some context for why I say that.

Not only do I think that the Federal commitment in terms of resources, which has grown almost exponentially the last several years, is a commitment that will make good on the pledge of No Child Left Behind, but if you look also at what has been going on at the State and local level--and as I mentioned a few moments ago, I was the State chief in the State of Pennsylvania for 6 years--almost every State has been engaged in developing an accountability system. I know Maryland has as well, as you know.

So it is not as though, with the investment of the taxpayers at the Federal, State and local level, it is not as though we are starting from scratch. If we were asking the States to begin afresh with an accountability approach based on those four principles, then the amount of investment we would have to make as a Nation would be far greater. But we have a strong down payment that has been made for several years in every State.

The Federal commitment has grown, as I said. And I think that the President's recommendations in this budget are more than adequate for the coming year to ensure that the implementation of this new law is both moving forward at the pace it needs to and having the potential results it needs to have.

INVESTMENT IN NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Secretary, I understand what you are saying. Of course, in one sense, the investment suggested here is 10 percent below what was authorized in the No Child Left Behind Act, approximately \$2.8 billion as opposed to the \$3.2 billion which was authorized--in those ball-park figures. You may be correct, but in one sense, we are underfunding, at least to the extent we passed the bill last year, in our expectation of what was necessary.

Mr. Hickok. Well, I understand that. Certainly the difference in authorization and appropriation is something that we see in every budget cycle, obviously not just in education, but throughout the Federal budget process. And I think that is the nature of that process.

But I have to say, and I might be somewhat of a lone eagle on this, but the amount of money that this Nation spends as a Nation on education is not providing, and has not provided, the kind of return on investment that we should demand in this country. And this budget that the President has submitted, along with last year's budget, which called for a pretty sizable increase in spending, I think says to the education establishment that we are committed at the Federal level, we are committed to seeing No Child Left Behind transform education, but we need to see that transformation begin as soon as possible. And as that transformation starts to take place, I think that will drive additional arguments for perhaps additional resources. But then we will know how best to target those resources to what works.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Secretary, I agree with you that we are not getting the return we ought to get. I think we have been sloppy in our expectations of both the performance of children and the performance of teachers. And, very frankly, I think the greatest group of people who are failing in America today in the education of their children are parents. If there is a culpable group in America in terms of children's education, it is parents. Not all parents, obviously. Some parents have high expectations for their children and are engaged with their children. But there are far too many parents who are not, and the children get that message very quickly that maybe this is not very important because mom doesn't think it is important or dad doesn't think it is important; or alternatively, mom and dad just don't have the time, which is tragic.

TEACHER SALARIES

But having said that, Secretary Paige, in response to a question by Mr. Sherwood--who just came in--talked about the differential. We have a pay-for-performance provision, as you know, in Title II of the education bill, which is underfunded in terms of quality of education and teacher quality, which, as you know, we have cut \$163 million from overall, if you take all the teacher quality programming.

So I hear what you are saying, but we have one of the most important things that any society does and we pay the people that we expect to perform that objective less than almost any other professional group in America.

Ms. Neuman. As a former teacher, I agree.

Mr. Hoyer. Secretary Neuman agrees. There is no dispute on that, Mr. Secretary. And with all this harping about how much money we are spending on education, I have three children who are the children of an extraordinary teacher who has 24 centers throughout the State named after her, early childhood multiservice centers, the Judy Centers, and none of them want to be teachers. Why? Because mom worked too hard and was paid too little.

So you can say we are spending too much money, but when we are paying starting teachers in St. Mary's County a wage that they cannot afford to have housing, leased or buying, something is wrong. I have nobody in my office with any responsibility, except the very, very lowest starting salary in my office, that is making what a starting teacher is making in St. Mary's County. You cannot expect young people to come into this with high expectations.

And you are absolutely right, we need to have high expectations. But if we are going to have high expectations and we are going to hire the kind of people who can meet those expectations, who can interface with children, parents, and administrators to accomplish the objectives that No Child Left Behind expects, we have to be competitive in the marketplace.

My time is up, and I will end. Obviously, that was not a question, but I would like your comments on that.

Mr. Hickok. And I would like Susan to comment on that as well. I don't think we are spending too much. One of my concerns is knowing what we are getting for the money we spend, making sure we are spending it the right way.

INVESTMENT IN TEACHER QUALITY

Mr. Hoyer. You and I agree 100 percent. We cannot have children obviously not able to read in the ninth grade and think we are getting what we are investing. I agree with that. Everybody has to agree. And we need to be tenacious in our expectations.

We have a lot of teachers, unfortunately, who slot children when they start: Oh, you are from a poor family; you are from a minority family; therefore, you cannot perform. That is hooey. There is not a child in America who cannot perform if they are expected to do so, and they will want to do so.

I have other questions I will get at in the next round, but in terms of our investment--and I would like to hear Secretary Neuman's comment on that, because I think, at heart, we are not competing in the marketplace for the talent necessary to meet our expectations of what we want them to do; and that is particularly true when we were talking about the District of Columbia. And the chairman asked the question that is particularly true in our urban areas, where it is much tougher.

You talked about pay differential. Any corporation that had a tough job in the United States, or we send people overseas to put them at risk, we pay them a differential. Why? Because they are at risk and it is tougher. And we have a lot of urban teachers who have a very tough job and we do not necessarily pay a differential. In fact, Montgomery and Fairfax could pay a lot more money because their base is a lot more. The chairman has spoken to this in terms of Cleveland, or any of our other

large cities in our States where they have a tougher job.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to just talk.

Mr. Regula. We can be a little more casual this morning. I think Ms. Neuman wants to comment, and then we will go to Mrs. Northup.

Ms. Neuman. I just wanted to mention that, as an ex-teacher, we always think we are a teacher. I can tell you that when I got into the profession, I got into the profession because I had a sense of mission; it wasn't the salary. We could never pay teachers enough for what they do for our children, when they are really excellent. But I went into it because it was a mission.

A lot of the teachers who are now in the position of teaching have not seen the progress that they need to see in terms of children's success. There are several things I think are critical in No Child Left Behind that will allow them to begin to see that.

One, the accountability will really begin to tell teachers, ``I am making a change in children's achievement.'' That is why they stay in teaching, not because they hope that they are going to get the greatest salary in the world. They stay in teaching because they want to help children. And when they begin to see that the accountability is affecting how children are achieving, there is more in that than anything.

The second thing is Reading First; as you know, it triples the Reading Excellence Act funding and reflects scientifically based evidence. Again, now our teachers will be able to receive high-quality professional development that will ensure that they really do know how to teach, and the accountability system will be influenced by that.

The third thing is, we have a number of initiatives, not just in Title II, that will focus on providing high-quality teachers to all of our children. There are a number of programs--Reading First, Early Reading First--that also provide professional development. But this is why people stay in teaching. They feel that they are doing their job well. And I think that the accountability system will begin to examine that.

Mr. Regula. Interesting observation.

Mrs. Northup, you can have extra time. We are pretty casual this morning.

Mrs. Northup. I agree with that; however, I wanted to comment on that, too.

I think Mr. Hoyer is right. We are not paying our teachers much, but I would like to make a couple of observations, as well.

STATE AND LOCAL INVESTMENT IN TEACHERS

First of all, the majority of the money that comes to school systems is from States and local governments. Now, they may be on very tight budgets right now, but 2 years ago in my State, they had huge surpluses and only upped the amount of money they invested in education at minimal levels, because they wanted to go build buildings and do all sorts of other glitzy things.

We spend anywhere from 7 to 9 percent, depending on the

study, of Federal dollars in our schools. Our dollars are not primarily the foundation of teachers' pay. The biggest expense our local schools have is teachers' pay. And when States make the decisions and local communities make the decisions to go spend the money on a lot of glitzy things instead of schools, there is a problem. I am hoping the accountability factor here will help put pressure to put it into education.

TEACHER SATISFACTION

I would also agree with you on teacher satisfaction. In Jefferson County we have about one-fifth to one-fourth of our students in the Catholic school system, which pays far less than the public school pays. But there is a great deal more satisfaction there because all the Federal bureaucracy and all the red tape and all the forms that have to be filled out don't apply to those teachers. So consequently, they can--if they have a child that has a problem--they can meet with the principal, they can meet with the parent, and they can try to work through the problems. Their hands aren't tied by a lot of red tape.

I just ran into a teacher last year who taught with me when I first got out of college. She went into teaching and she was fabulous. She said to me, ``I retired 2 years ago because I couldn't stand the red tape that was involved any more.''

Now, we have done nothing to help alleviate that. We may have added dollars, but for every dollar we added, we added a lot more forms and red tape and things that made teacher dissatisfaction higher and did nothing to relieve some of the problems that they have.

Finally, I will say that the overwhelming complaint I hear from teachers concerns children that have behavioral problems and have learning disabilities and other problems. They feel their hands are tied in terms of recommending the best solution for those children. Consequently, they have to neglect the other children due to mainstreaming requirements.

Now, we all agree that mainstreaming is hugely important to all children in terms of socialization, but as a mother that had some children with a learning disability that I could afford to put in a special school so that they learned to read by fourth grade and learned to read at the top of their class I resent, on behalf of parents who also have children with learning disabilities, that they told by their school, ``we can't provide a separate, intensive, explicit intervention for your child because your child has to be in a mainstreamed classroom.''

Parents don't like it and the teachers don't like it, but there is this idea that Federal regulation mandates that.

So in terms of the bureaucracy, there is the Federal red tape and not allowing flexibility. The more we talk about our responsibility, Mr. Hoyer, in my opinion, for teacher salaries, the more we convey to our States and local communities that they do not have to wring their own hands over this. And I think that is wrong.

Mr. Regula. Would you like to comment?

FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

Mr. Hoyer. I just want to make sure that I am not misinterpreted as saying that States and localities don't have a responsibility. They do. My response was to the fact that we spend a lot of money on education. We do.

Do we waste some money on education? Yes, just as we do in almost every other large enterprise that we spend a lot of money on. Defense, education, welfare, whatever it is, if you spend a lot of money, you are going to waste some money because that is just the way it is, including most successful large corporations in America. They do, as well.

What my point is, and I want to make two points, first of all, we keep using this 6 or 7 percent figure. That is a misleading percentage. It is a misleading percentage because the Federal Government really doesn't engage in most of education. It engages, however, pretty significantly, at two levels: at-risk young children and higher education. That is where the Federal Government engages.

The large number of average students from 1 to 12 really are not substantially impacted by the Feds. But at-risk children from economically deprived families, I will bet, Mr. Secretary--well, if I can ask, do you know what that percentage is for those children? Because it must be in the neighborhood of 30 to 35 percent.

Mrs. Northup. Of what?

Mr. Hoyer. Of at-risk, economically challenged children.

Mr. Hickok. You are exactly right. The bulk of the Federal effort is targeted toward at-risk, low-income children.

Mrs. Northup. Right.

Mr. Hoyer. So my point is, when we use the 6 or 7 percent, it looks like we are not making much of an impact. And that is, of course, true for the overwhelming majority of students in our primary and secondary education system, because most of our dollars, as I say, go to at-risk young children and to higher education.

We spend a lot of money in higher education and we spend a significant amount of money--do you see my point?

Mrs. Northup. No, I don't. Because my question is, if we are going to raise teacher salaries, they will be raised in suburban schools--in schools that don't have Title I kids--and they are all on the same schedule, based on the negotiated salary with the union.

So do you think we should be responsible for getting all their salaries up? I thought we were targeted on at-risk kids.

Mr. Hoyer. Let me respond to that.

We are in an extraordinarily mobile society. And the fact that the child in Mississippi or the child in California or the child in Maryland is treated disparately impacts the Nation, frankly. It is not like it was, in my opinion, 100 years ago, where the child in Mississippi or the child in California or the child in Maryland would probably 40 years later be in Maryland, be in Mississippi, or still be in California. That is not true today. They are all over the country, very rapidly.

Therefore, what I think the President was talking about, President Bush, with which I agree, is that, hey, these are American children, and we have some responsibility to make sure----

Mrs. Northup. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I don't lose the rest of my time here.

Mr. Hoyer. I think we have all used much more time than any of us have.

Mr. Regula. We are much more casual here. Wait till we hear from the school board here in a minute.

Mr. Hoyer. We need to make sure that what the national testing--which, by the way, I am for; I was for it when Clinton proposed it, and I was for it when Bush proposed it. There were an awful lot of people that weren't for it, and they will make some distinction about what Clinton was for, a voluntary test and not a mandatory one; but they were against that and now they are for this.

I am sure there is a distinction which has eluded me, but other than its being Clinton's proposal and Bush's proposal, other than that, I think the concept is absolutely accurate.

The parent in Mississippi, the parent in Maryland and the parent in California needs to know, because their children are going to move around America, and indeed globally, how is my child doing; not as it relates to just the children I am going to school with, because they are all awful and my child is doing a little better than awful. That is not so great if, in fact, the Maryland child is not doing as well as the child in Mississippi or California.

Teacher salaries, my point was, Anne, that when we say we spend a lot of money on education, yes, the majority of that is on salaries; not on buildings, not on books, on salaries. Why? Because any large enterprise, Defense Department, is largely salaries, comes close there because we do so much on capital spending. Therefore, yes, we spend a lot, but are we spending enough? If you are Bill Gates at Microsoft and you spend X number of dollars on personnel and it doesn't make you competitive, it is too little.

Mrs. Northup. If I could just go on because----

Mr. Hoyer. That is my point.

READING FIRST

Mrs. Northup. Okay. Let me go on and ask you about Reading First. That is really what my questions were about. I am concerned about what sort of quality control there is going to be in terms of Reading First. What programs are going to be approved?

Specifically, I understand that we know the criteria of programs that help children, especially children at risk that are most likely to fail based on all our demographics. And those children often happen to have the fewest choices of where they might go if the system in place for them fails.

My concern is, if States are going to be the ones to approve this and they have no expertise in what makes a good reading program, how is there going to be quality control as we appropriate this money?

Ms. Neuman. That is a wonderful question and something, of course, I am very concerned about as well. I think we have a number of good ways of ensuring that that happens, or at least ensuring that that happens most often.

As you know, the applications have just gone out for

Reading First. States are beginning to develop their plans. We have had the Secretary's reading leadership academies here in Washington that were really designed to focus on what is scientifically based evidence. What do we know about screening, diagnostic, and classroom-based methods of testing, and how can we ensure that teachers are professionally capable of delivering this instruction? One of the things we also talked about was quality of instructional programs, which you talked about just now.

After the application is completed, States will be sending it back, and then a team of experts will be looking at that application. And if, in fact, the approach does not indicate scientifically based approaches and a clear definition of exactly what they will do and how they will compete it with the local school districts, they will not receive the funds until they receive some kind of technical assistance to ensure that it is high quality.

Mrs. Northup. I think what concerns me is, for example, in Louisville. We have what we call the Five-Block Program.

Ms. Neuman. I know.

Mrs. Northup. I mean, it is terrible. Fifty percent of our schools declined in reading last year. We have a superintendent who insists that this is a good program and says it contains phonics, even though phonics is the smallest part of this program.

We have 28 inner-city ministers who have come together for at least 6 years, begging for a phonics-based system for their children. These students are the ones most likely to fail. They are all minority students, they are disadvantaged, their parents don't have any choice, and yet he believes in a much more Whole Language, learn-at-your-own-rate, limited systematic approach to reading.

The one school in our district that did fabulous on the reading test over and above their recommendations changed to a phonics-based system with direct instruction. They went from a 47 to a 73 score. And what happened? The next month they removed the principal because they didn't want him talking about how important phonics was. Now, what do they say? ``Oh, we qualify it, we have phonics as one of our blocks.''

So how do you see through that and make sure that the parents that are asking for a true research-based program get it?

READING DEBATE

Ms. Neuman. Again, your questions are just right on target and wonderful. I mean, it is something that we are grappling with all the time.

As you well know, reading has been a source of ideological warfare rather than anything based on real, sound scientific evidence. For many teachers, the term scientifically based reading research is a scary term, and they are disinclined to go in that direction. They think it is an art and that it should not be necessarily a science.

So I don't want to suggest that is an easy battle, because I think it is not. I think it is a battle for the hearts and the minds of American children.

Mrs. Northup. These aren't the teachers and these aren't

the parents. This is the superintendent.

My question is, how are you going to be able to look at a program and decide--and the State, I guess, is going to be the one that is going to decide--whether this program qualifies or not. If you have a State that generally takes the biggest school system in the State and says yes to it, whatever it wants, how does that work?

READING FIRST

Ms. Neuman. You will see, in the application form, that it asks for very specific information. We do not specifically ask for programs, the name of a program; rather, we ask that they provide scientific evidence that that program works and that the scientific evidence is indicated through a peer-reviewed journal, and not some microfiche clearinghouse, but it really is in a peer-reviewed journal with experts who have looked at those data.

So they will have to describe and justify their program. And then a team of experts will be looking at that to ensure that that happens.

In addition, let me just say that we are in the process now of developing a very stringent peer technical assistance system where we believe that we will have to very aggressively monitor those programs to ensure that once the money goes through the State, to the school district, that they continue to use scientifically based evidence.

Mr. Hickok. Plus, if I could just add on, we are going to say that after 2 years we want to see what the results are of this process. And if we see the kind of results you are talking about, where you see either a static or a decline, we are going to say something about whether or not those funds continue to flow to the local level.

So part of this is to have in the application a much higher set of principles you are going to have to demonstrate and, then, technical assistance to help you get there; but in the end, also some consequences if you are not successful.

Of all the areas of education, we know what works in reading. The tragedy is, we know it and far too many people don't do it and your Louisville example is a dramatic illustration of that. With any combination of luck and persistence, that will be the exception and not the norm in the next couple of years.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Sherwood, you have been very patient. You have had 20 years of experience with these kind of problems, so here is your opportunity.

Mr. Sherwood. Well, thank you.

CHALLENGES IN EDUCATION

About 25 years ago, when I first came on the school board, we were just going into a new elementary school with pods and no walls. What a dumb thing to do. And yet the experts had convinced us that that was the right thing to do. Well, it took us about 3 years to put walls up and get our classrooms back under control.

My experience is, it takes a lot of hard work and

commitment to run a good public school; and I think you are on the right track with accountability. We have to be accountable. I said in here yesterday that I thought one of the greatest tragedies of the public school system was that we pay the worst teachers in the system and the best teachers in the system exactly the same amount of money if they had the same education and the same time in grade.

I think you should set down common-sense rules and regulations that apply to the school district's use of Federal dollars and fund your mandates.

Now, we know that the average school in Pennsylvania only gets about 8 percent of their money from the Federal Government, but it is targeted. It is primarily the school district's and the State's responsibility to fund education. I don't think it is the Federal Government's responsibility to fund all elementary and secondary education. But I do think the Federal Government has some responsibility to help fund the things they mandate. Special education is a great example of such a mandate.

I don't consider myself an expert on education, but I do think I have some experience on how a school board acts and what a school board member's responsibilities are. And I would say that the most critical thing the school board does ever is hire the superintendent. The minute they think they have one on the wrong track; they had better find another one. Because it is the superintendent who runs the schools. The school board's responsibility is to raise the money and to hire a competent superintendent.

But when Federal regulations come down, and a school board does not have the money to implement them, that leads to the greatest moral dilemma of a school board today. They must decide which students get the money. Because if they spend as much money as the law would suggest, on appropriate education, on the very small percentage of kids with special needs, it really detracts from what you are able to do with the other 85 percent. And I am not sure but what the Federal Government has not given school districts a little bit of a hard goal there.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

With that little bit of ``philosophy according to Sherwood,'' there is one thing I would like to ask you, Dr. Hickok. I am sure you are aware that with charter schools we have a lot of controversy going on right now in Pennsylvania with Einstein.

Mr. Hickok. Yes, I know about it.

Mr. Sherwood. I am sure you do. And I would like to know a little bit more about what you know about it.

When charter schools came out, I was a real advocate of them because I had been fighting for years what I thought was the inertia of the system. So I am very willing to try some new things as long as they make sense.

We have a tenure law in Pennsylvania that is probably counterproductive to education, but there probably isn't a State legislature in the world that would have the political capital to change it, and those are some of the things we work under.

Where are we with Einstein and what sort of Federal oversight of charter school programs are appropriate?

Mr. Hickok. My knowledge of Einstein is really primarily through the same newspapers you probably read. I think I am accurate with this. The State Department of Education, under my successor, reached an agreement with regard to payment to that charter school, but the issues surrounding Einstein are larger than Einstein, and that is, how do you hold schools accountable?

Mr. Sherwood. And that is the thrust of my question.

Mr. Hickok. I think Einstein, at least in Pennsylvania, is the exception. This is a school that evidently has not been delivering the promised curriculum services that it says it is going to deliver, for a number of reasons.

But the issue of accountability in a charter school really boils down to this: The beauty of the charter school movement is, if it doesn't work, you close it down. We have seen that in Pennsylvania and we have seen it in States across the country. The beauty of the charter school system is these are public schools that either deliver on their promise or they cease to exist. That is, again, the exception in public education and not the norm.

Although I will say this: Just yesterday, in the city of Chicago, the superintendent announced they are going to close, I think, three elementary schools that don't work, as opposed to continuing to prop them up.

So I think the charter school system is----

Mr. Sherwood. Well, Chicago is an unusual situation.

Mr. Hickok. Yes, it is.

Mr. Sherwood. The governor took over the schools; and they apparently have the authority to do as management sees fit, and that is unusual.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. Hickok. And I guess my larger point is, and I used to be a school board member myself, that should not be the exception. We should be able, in this country as we manage school districts, to deal with performance in a way that holds the system accountable. We should be able to reward outstanding performance in teachers and schools, and we should be able to deal with poor performance in teachers and schools. Right now, we can do very little of either of those things. That is why this accountability is so important.

I think, in the end, it will be more difficult to ignore failure. And that has been a huge problem in public education; we close our eyes to it, and that is a shame. We shouldn't do that. We should do something about it.

Mr. Sherwood. And I think that is--part of the Federal Government's role----

Mr. Hickok. Yes.

Mr. Sherwood [continuing]. Is to make the public aware of the state of and the progress or the lack of progress, the state of education in the country. And we can have the debates about teacher pay and so forth. There are many school districts in this country where teachers are paid solidly in the middle of the middle class and have wonderful security and think they

have very good jobs. There are others that are different, I understand.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

One thing that I would think you should keep in your deliberations, as a school board member, I think the pool of qualified administrators is becoming critical. There are many reasons for that. But when you go out to hire a new superintendent or a new high school principal, right now, you are lucky if you get the quality of applicants that you would like to look over, and there is just a little bit of a shortage there.

You do not find too much of a shortage when you need to hire teachers, except in math and science. But your administrator pool is quite often lacking, and that is so crucial. I think we have a little institutional dysfunction. Normally, people aspire to the next level of responsibility. In public education, I am not sure that is true any more.

Mr. Hickok. Just to follow up very briefly. We also have to look at how people are prepared to become leaders in education. Education has changed a lot. The world in which public schools exist has changed a lot. But in most places the way we prepare teachers and the way we prepare administrators hasn't changed much, and that is a big concern of ours.

That is one reason why No Child Left Behind is so important, because the tools needed to run a district are different tools than they were 30 years ago, and we need to make sure our leaders are prepared to use those tools.

Mr. Sherwood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Mr. Regula. Well, I think both your comments and Mr. Sherwood's are right on target. I am a little concerned that in this program there is not enough emphasis on the quality of teachers in the classroom and, particularly, on quality principals, because they become the leader of that school, and the quality of superintendents.

I think Mr. Sherwood makes a good point. I am not sure that this program addresses that problem. Your Title I goes to those who require some special attention; but to have a quality school system, you are going to have to somehow get into the--and I am not sure what our role is working with colleges of education--to get good teachers, A, to get good principals, B, and to get good superintendents, because the battlefield is no better than the general.

What is your response?

Mr. Hickok. We have had a lot of conversations with schools of education, both formally and informally. And one of the things we have told not just the schools of education, to be honest with you, but higher education generally, is that preparing teachers and professional development should be a much higher priority in all of education. Certainly not only the schools of education need to do a better job, but all of higher education; we are pretty consistent in telling

university and college presidents they need to step up on this issue.

Also, if you look at the law, it references highly qualified, high quality teaching. That is an important term. You will notice in the law it doesn't say ``certified,'' it says ``qualified.'' We make the distinction in far too many places, and I will fall upon my experience in Pennsylvania, in far too many places they certify a teacher. This is really just certified in the sense that it is a sort of minimal standard to become a teacher.

In a standards-based environment, teachers need a lot more time on content. They need a lot more background in disciplines. Certainly in reading, now that we know what works, teachers need to be taught how to teach reading. And not just elementary schoolteachers, sadly, but everyone needs to be exposed to it.

And so, in No Child Left Behind we talk about the importance of alternative approaches to becoming teachers, and the Troops to Teachers and Transition to Teaching programs. We talk about better professional development that tries to relate professional development to student achievement and success. It is a very critical area, and I think that the policies under Title II and Transition to Teaching and other programs demonstrate this has to be a primary focus.

But again, to follow up on Susan's comments earlier, this is kind of a culture shift. To ask the schools of education to think differently about how they prepare teachers and to ask university presidents to spend more time talking about how other faculty from the arts and sciences ought to be spending time on this will take some time to achieve. But I think it is a very important part of this conversation.

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Ms. Neuman. I just wanted to add a point, as a previous professor of education and I feel a little guilty saying this. But our teacher preparation programs in the universities, some of our very finest universities, are a cash cow for the university. Unfortunately, they have often financed other programs.

And this just really is unfortunate, because many of our teachers are coming out of our 4-year institutions, good schools, not well prepared. Many of them are going back getting their Master's degrees and still not knowing the research behind what is good instruction in our schools. It is a terrible problem.

I think what we have tried to do so far is--in addition to Title II--I think we have really tried to use the bully pulpit in a number of ways, bringing in large university systems and saying that licensure does not mean total academic freedom to teach whatever you want. What we need to do is have teachers who are highly qualified in the areas in which they teach.

One of our recent surveys shows that over 56 percent of our elementary schoolteachers only have a general education degree. Now, this is very serious, because what we are finding is our teachers are not capable in basic literature, reading, and math. How can they possibly teach our children when they do not

know the materials themselves?

So one of the things that we think is extremely important is subject matter competence, so that we get teachers who really do know their subjects and can convey that information to our children.

Mr. Regula. I had the president of a State university in Ohio in yesterday and raised this issue with him. They have a 5-year program, and they start teachers in the academic programs before they get to the how-to courses.

TITLE I FUNDING

Would you have a problem if we shifted as a policy matter some of the Title I allocation into this teacher program? We have to make decisions here. Where do we get the most bang for the buck in terms of America's children? I think we have to have more emphasis on teacher and principal and superintendent programs.

We have a finite amount of money here, so we might have to move some of the Title I money over to these other programs, or Title II. What is your feeling?

Mr. Hickok. My number one goal, and I know Secretary Paige's number one goal with Title I, is to see what kind of a difference it makes. That should be our goal with all of our investments. But certainly since the largest single investment is in Title I for our most needy students and our most difficult schools, the first goal should be to find out whether or not we are getting the kind of results we should get. Part of that should be, I think, devoted--Title I money in schools--to improving teacher quality, because these kids need the best teachers.

Whether we want to divert that in terms of teacher quality to teacher preparation programs is a separate debate. I think most of us would agree, whether it is Federal dollars or not, that this country needs to really focus on this whole notion of teacher preparation. And in far too many places it has not received the kind of attention, at least, it should.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Mr. Regula. I think Ms. Neuman hit it on the head. A lot of colleges see it as a cash cow. And I think I am going to get the president of the university in question in here when we do the hearing on teacher quality to tell about the program they have. I was extremely impressed. They are treating it as a profession, not just as something to get a teacher out in a classroom.

Mrs. Northup. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Yes.

Mrs. Northup. Let me just say that, first of all, that we have a 5-year program now at the University of Louisville and the students don't like it. In 4 years we train engineers; we train all sorts of people in 4 years. I don't think that you need longer than that.

I told you about my school system and the reading, so it probably wouldn't surprise you to find out that U of L teaches all Whole Language. So, overnight, they would change their

program. If the only reading teachers Jefferson County hired were people that understood phonics, they would change their program. But right now every teacher gets to teach the way they want to teach.

Five years at U of L doesn't help if they are not learning what the science-based reading is. There has to be a discipline here. It is not a question of how many years or of diverting money. We have to have an outcome-based system.

Mr. Regula. Of course, this goes to the question of what do you pay? If you are going to treat it as a true profession, you have to pay on that basis.

We can have a pretty rocky discussion here, and maybe we will when we bring some of the people in on the day that we talk about teacher preparation, et cetera.

Mr. Regula. Ms. Pelosi.

Ms. Pelosi. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman; and our witnesses, thank you for being here. Thank you for your testimony.

INVESTMENT IN NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

I was interested to read, Secretary Hickok, that you said the enactment of No Child Left Behind was a watershed event in the history of Federal support in K through 12 education, and it gives you great pleasure to discuss its significance and the Department's efforts to ensure its successful implementation across this country. I think everyone was very pleased. There are many people across the country who were very pleased and helpful when the President signed that bipartisan piece of legislation. That is why it is hard for me to understand, as I expressed to the distinguished Secretary yesterday, how he could come in here with a budget request that is \$7.2 billion short of the authorization of No Child Left Behind. You should call it, I said to the Secretary, the Millions of Children Left Behind Act.

You just talked a great deal about the teacher training, and indeed the request you make cuts teacher training, when H.R. 1 increased requirements for teacher qualifications to a \$163 million difference; concerns about freezing funds for after school programs, when only 8 percent of eligible children are served; freezing funds for bilingual education, when new requirements were just enacted and need increasing.

Yesterday, I asked the Secretary, but his response was vague, but how are we going to deal with additional needs for testing for children who are bilingual?

They talked about test development generally. They said, we put too much money in test development, actually, but ignored the specific challenges that schools with a multilingual student base.

The other point is that this whole discussion is indicative of the fact that there is not enough money in this budget for either Title I or teacher training. So I get concerned when we talk about Title I funding over the loosest interpretation of what Title I funding is supposed to be for.

But listing those is just some of my concerns. I get back to the basic question, how can you discuss the significance of the bill, your efforts to ensure its successful implementation

when your request is \$7.2 billion short of what the bill calls for?

Mr. Hickok. We had a pretty interesting discussion on this issue a few minutes ago before you were here, in the sense that I think it is not unusual in the budget process in this town to see a pretty dramatic, sometimes, distinction, whether in education or any other Federal agency or Federal purpose, between authorization and appropriation levels.

2003 BUDGET REQUEST

Ms. Pelosi. If I just may, I appreciate that, because we live in that world here. But this bill was heralded--it was a banner bipartisan bill that was going to meet the needs, and you specifically said how you were going to ensure that bill's successful implementation. That bill's successful implementation, not the generality of authorization, is about policy; and appropriations is about appropriating resources. But you said the successful implementation of that bill which has \$7.2 billion more in it than what you were requesting.

Mr. Hickok. I think the amount of money that we have received in the current budget and the budget that we are asking Congress to look at now is money that will enable us to successfully implement No Child Left Behind.

You mentioned the teacher issue, for example. If you look at 1996, the Federal effort on teacher quality, if you will, broadly conceived, was about \$300 million. Now it is closer to \$3 billion. That is a substantial increase. And I think it is--
--

Ms. Pelosi. But you are talking about the past. I am talking about the bill that the President waved as the banner, the sign of hope to children across America. I understand you want to put it in historical context, but the fact is that I am asking about that bill that passed this Congress. And, you know, I respect what you do and I want to extend every courtesy to you here, but I wish you would answer the question. Not about 1996 and increases that we all voted for in the Clinton administration for teacher training but how we are going to implement No Child Left Behind and the promise that extended to the American people and to their children.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to be contentious, but children are very smart. This bill, as important as it is, doesn't even go to the issue of school modernization, which is a very important need that isn't being addressed in any of the initiatives that we have.

We tell children that education is important to them, that it is about their own self-fulfillment, it is about economic survival, it is about the international competitiveness of our great country. We tell them that it is important. They must study and work hard in school. And yet we are willing to send them to schools that are not up to par. If we don't place a value on it, how do we expect children to? And they not are wired for the future, not equipped.

So if children are smart, if we say this is important, if

we say our life's work in Congress is to invest in education because it is key to the future and then we do something so far short when it comes to the money, it is disappointing.

Because I thought we were all in this together in a very bipartisan way to help children and to keep--everything we see in science in the other part of our jurisdiction in this committee tells us children do better in smaller classes, indeed many in smaller schools. And yet we ignore that sign by not putting money into the modernization.

This isn't about spending, it is about investing. Nothing is more dynamic to our economy or to our budget than investing in education. There is no tax cut, no anything that you can do that brings more money to the national Treasury than educating American people, whether it is early child, K through 12, higher education or lifetime learning.

So that is why, when this bill which is so key and so central to all of that, even though it ignored, it doesn't go into the school modernization piece of it, comes in so far short it raises questions about how on earth we could have ever made those promises to the American people about what we were going to do on education when before the ink was really dry on it you come in with such a meager budget.

I probably have no time left. I used my time. If the Chairman will allow a comment, I invite it.

But I know you said you have been through this before. You are going to be through it again. No, it doesn't add up. It does not add up. It just--it can't work at \$7 billion short.

I don't know if I have any time.

Mr. Regula. Well, we have been rather casual about time this morning, so I will give you a few minutes.

Ms. Pelosi. In fairness to the witnesses.

Mr. Regula. Would you like a few extra minutes?

Ms. Pelosi. Just if they would like to comment. I won't say any more.

2003 BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. Hickok. I guess the best way I can phrase it is, we disagree. I think the budget that we have asked Congress to look at with regard to education is a budget that will allow us to implement. And my job is to oversee that implementation, along with the Secretary, of No Child Left Behind. It takes many years for implementation, as you know, but this is the first year with this new law; and I think we can assure you that this budget will be enough to get that job started. Especially when you look at the fact that, as I said earlier, this is not starting from scratch.

It would be a far different set of issues if we were going to the States and saying we have to create out of whole cloth accountability systems and testing systems and academic standards and professional development. The fact is that every State, in a variety of different ways, has been engaged in this work. This is really an attempt to make a more rational accountability system from what is already taking place.

But I just think that we feel very strongly, and I can't say that strongly enough, that we feel this budget allows us to do that good work.

Ms. Pelosi. This was your professional judgment request?

Mr. Hickok. Yes.

Ms. Pelosi. Your professional judgment request on the implementation of No Child Left Behind is what you are asking here today?

Mr. Hickok. Not only that, but I will say my previous career was State Chief in Pennsylvania. As a State Chief--I consider those people now my former colleagues--I think that as I look at this budget from that perspective I will always want more. That is not a debate. But I think this is a responsible, prudent budget for the first year of implementation of the No Child Left Behind.

Ms. Pelosi. You don't find a problem with the shortfall of \$7 billion?

Mr. Hickok. I don't consider it a shortfall.

Mr. Regula. I think this has been a provocative discussion this morning. I think one of the things we heard from both sides yesterday is that we have to manage funds as effectively as possible, and that is going to be your challenge. We will look at the results in a year from now and say are you getting--is the education level improving? Because, while it may not be enough, we have committed a substantial sum in the last 2 years; and, perhaps even more importantly, we have made this one of our goals, is to--and we would all agree to say No Child Left Behind is an enormous challenge.

And, of course, it represents a partnership, well, among I would say the parents, the teachers, the school superintendents, the States, the Federal--you as Federal administrators, if we are to succeed. And I think the challenge before you and us, to an extent, is how do we best get that goal accomplished.

STATE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Maybe you would like to comment, and then we will go back around for some additional questions as to just how you think we are going to get this done. We test and we have accountability and there are some flaws in all of that, as you well know, but how do we get this done? How do we end up 2 years from now with children having a better education opportunity than they have today?

Mr. Hickok. I will ask Susan to comment as well.

I am going to go out on a limb on this a bit. If we are successful as citizens with developing State accountability systems so that we are able to determine with clarity how well students are doing, how well schools are doing so we can find success and not failure, so we can replicate success, that can have enormous consequences and fantastic consequences for the discussions about resource allocation.

In other words, if I am at the State level, or if I am a superintendent at the local level I am much better off going to my school board to ask for more money or my community. I am much better off coming to Congress if I have evidence of where my needs are, evidence that is hard to close your eyes to. That is what an accountability system is all about. It is making it easier to make tough decisions, as a parent, as a teacher, as a principal, as a Congress.

So one of our hopes is that, down the road, as this is fully implemented, when future Departments of Education, let's say, come and ask Congress for more money, we will be able to do it in a way that gives you the kind of confidence that is a smart investment, as opposed to every year coming in and asking for more money because that is what we do in this country. That is what our hope is in terms of full implementation.

Accountability in its fullest sense is not about holding anybody individually responsible for bad performance or good performance. It is about making sure that a system is accountable and responsible for the needs of the citizens.

Ms. Neuman. I was just going to say that the wonderful thing about No Child Left Behind, it is not just an accountability system. It is a theory of action. And that is why we respectfully disagree, I believe, on resources. What I mean by that is not only do we have an accountability system that really begins to tell us where children are and where the resources should be allocated, but on the other side, for the first time, we are focusing on the best quality of instruction and providing high-quality teachers in our schools.

BUDGET REQUEST AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I wanted to go back to a comment you made before about teacher training and less monies in teacher training. But the fact of the matter is teacher training is throughout this bill. If we look at Reading First professional development, Early Reading First professional development, Title I professional development, and Title II professional development, what we are doing is we are more thoroughly providing instruction to our teachers on scientifically-based evidence which will ensure that we begin to see results.

And that is what this Administration is all about. We do not want to just throw money at things, but we want to look at what makes a difference in children's lives. And in children's lives what we are focusing on particularly is reading and math achievement.

Ms. Pelosi. We don't want to throw money at anything.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Yes, I think we have a little time. I would like to have another round. Let's try to limit to 5 minutes each on this round of questions.

Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. Hoyer. Madam Secretary, let me join Ms. Pelosi. That shibboleth of throwing money at things is a fraud, and we ought to stop that rhetoric. It is political tripe. There is nobody in Congress that wants to throw money at things. There are some people who want to spend a lot more money on defense because they think we need it. Some people think we need more money in education because we want to accomplish results. Nobody wants to throw money at things, and that doesn't fly, frankly, with all due respect.

Mr. Secretary, I want you to provide for the record that which you asked for from the Secretary for No Child Left Behind implementation.

[The information follows:]

Request to the Secretary for No Child Left Behind Programs

The Department's internal budget planning begins in the summer before the Administration's budget is presented to the Congress, and the Department usually generates its internal funding proposal for elementary and secondary education programs during that time. Last year, while the Department worked on its Fiscal Year 2003 budget, congressional action to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was well underway, but it was too soon to prepare a funding plan with internal budget recommendations for ESEA implementation.

The bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) was signed into law on January 8, 2002, a month prior to the release of the President's Fiscal Year 2003 budget. Late last year, after the Administration had a fairly good, albeit incomplete, picture of the provisions included in the new law, Administration officials including the Secretary, Dr. Hickok, and other senior Department officials met to discuss the new budget and to make decisions with regard to a funding plan for implementing the proposed legislation. The final numbers, including a \$1 billion increase in ESEA Title I and a \$100 million increase in reading, are reflected in the Fiscal Year 2003 request. Because of the timing, the Secretary received no internal Fiscal Year 2003 funding plan for NCLBA implementation prior to making final decisions.

Mr. Hoyer. That money obviously was not provided, in my opinion. You said you would always like more, but Ms. Pelosi's question was, what, in your professional judgment. I presume the budget you submitted to Secretary Paige was in your professional judgment what was needed to implement No Child Left Behind. My presumption is you didn't get it. I want to know what it was. Because that, in my opinion, was your professional judgment.

2003 BUDGET REQUEST

Secondly, you talk about teacher quality. These are teacher quality programs. It is very nice to have it in every part of the bill, every part of the Act. But if you underfund every part of the Act, there is a net reduction of \$163,000,000 in teacher quality programs.

Let me tell you about a program that I am particularly concerned about. We talk about national standards so people across the country know whether their teachers or students are performing at level. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards didn't come out of Washington. It came out of the governors. It was an initiation of the governors in a bipartisan way. You have zero funded it. Zero. That is no place else in the bill, with all due respect, Madam Secretary, no place. You can't find it anywhere else in the bill.

Now, are there quality teacher provisions in the bills in other provisions? Sure, there are. And you have underfunded a lot of them. One hundred percent cut in the Eisenhower teaching; 50 percent cut in traditional American history; 100 percent cut in preparing tomorrow's teachers to use technology. That is a critical program.

You can say, well, the locals ought to do it. Of course the locals ought to do it, and the local taxpayer could do it. But

obviously, as I pointed out, one of the reasons we are doing No Child Left Behind is because we think we have a national responsibility. President Bush thought we had a national responsibility.

I don't disagree with any of the rhetoric that President Bush uses in terms of expectations and objectives. I don't think anybody does. I hope they don't. And if they do I disagree with them, because I think President Bush is right; and I am glad that he has elevated this.

But I will tell you something I think I mentioned to Secretary Paige yesterday and I mentioned to you, that when A Child at Risk was issued, you know what the response of the Reagan budget was 1 year later? To cut the Department of Education budget by 15 percent. Now, that didn't fly. The Congress didn't do that. Neither side of the aisle in this committee, which acted in a very bipartisan way, adopted that proposition.

But I will tell you something. While I don't think we need to throw money at things, you are not going to accomplish these objectives without spending resources any more than you are going to develop a good product without investing capital. That is just the nature of the business.

So, my 5 minutes is up. But I will end with this question.

DIFFERENT ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

March 20th you received a letter from various Senators, including Bingaman and Kennedy and Dodd and Edwards, Lieberman and Clinton, with reference to the No Child Left Behind Act clearly states the assessments chosen by a State to meet the requirements of an act must be the same academic assessments used to measure the achievements of all children.

The reason I bring that up and their concern was the 50 States making determinations. Now the problem with that is you fall back into the same problem that you have referred to in your testimony as to whether or not there was a standard. There was no criteria that a parent could look to and say whether that State or the other State, we are meeting some national criteria, not an individually, discretely determined criteria, whether it be in Kentucky or Maryland, which you can't--you say you can't do it. NAEP obviously tries to do it and other assessment tools. But they are very concerned about it.

I don't have the answer. What is your response to that?

Ms. Neuman. I was head of the negotiated rulemaking. I believe that letter was about the concern about local and State assessment, the combination of local and State assessments.

I think you raise a very important point. Because what we were concerned about is, while we think under some conditions it can work, we are always concerned that different local areas will have different standards, different quality assessments. So, in response to that, we held the bar very, very high.

ALIGNING ASSESSMENTS

In other words, what we are saying and what was said in the negotiated rulemaking process was that if a State would want to use a combination of local and State assessments, the local

assessments would have to be equivalent in depth, breadth and quality to the State assessments; and they would have to be calibrated statistically so that you could actually see equivalent forms on assessments. That is a very high bar.

So our concern--yes, we had that same concern. What--we hoped what we did is address that issue.

Mr. Hoyer. So your objective is to try to have some national level of which others can assess their performance.

Ms. Neuman. Not national. It will be State by State. But what we are saying is that the local school districts, for example, Detroit and Ann Arbor, will be at the same level so that the State has a similar bar in terms of depth, breadth and quality.

Mr. Hoyer. Will there be a way for the Michigan parents to determine whether they are performing as well as the California or New York?

Ms. Neuman. Yes, it will be calibrated along the State system, which is actually not that easy to do.

Mr. Hoyer. If you calibrate it, won't that sort of give you a norm? Is that what you are looking for?

Ms. Neuman. We will get bars of proficiency, basic proficiency, advanced. So what they will have to do is statistically align that local assessment to the Statewide assessment.

Mr. Regula. Mrs. Northup.

Mr. Hoyer. I apologize. I have to go to another hearing. I am not walking out on you.

Mrs. Northup. The point is CTBS, the Iowa standard--all of these--would have the incentive to lower their bar if you don't calibrate them. So what you do is allow States to choose whatever tests they want, but you will make sure they are all calibrated. So that a CTBS test that says you are excellent is just like an Iowa test that says you are excellent.

Testers do this all the time. It is hard. It is one way we make sure that SAT tests are the same difficulty year in and year out. After the test is taken, they calibrate it in order to make sure that there is a comparison standard.

EDUCATION INPUTS VS. OUTCOMES

You know, I want to address the input basis versus outcome basis of analyzing a school system, because I think we have gotten a lot of rhetoric here about more input basis.

For years, our school systems, both locally and what we did nationally, measured whether we were doing a good job based on what we put into it both moneywise and also by regulations. We would say, ``you have to spend 2 hours and 3 minutes a week on reading.''

This is why, Mr. Chairman, that, outside education at the State level, you had the arts education people wanting to increase from 15 minutes a week to 25 minutes a week the importance of art education because this would profoundly affect children. Then the next hour you had the economic people that came in and said every child should have economic education.

So you would ratchet the week down to where it is in this many minutes and every teacher was given input. Not just money

input but direction on how they were to spend every day in terms of hours and minutes and so forth.

What we found is, at the end of many years of improving the system with inputs, that our children were coming out of school less prepared than they were before all these new inputs.

So the more modern way is to say we are not going to tell you how many minutes a day you spend on reading. We are not going to tell you how many minutes a day you spend on arts. We are not going to tell you exactly what you do. Because every child is different, every community is different, every State is different. It is not surprising that what they need in my inner city school is different than what they need in the mountains of Wyoming in terms of the way they break down the day.

What an outcome based system says is that we are also not going to tell you every single way you have to spend every dollar, that you have to spend this many dollars on crayons for kids, that you have to spend this many dollars on teacher preparation every single year, every single month. That we are not going to tell you how many dollars you have to spend on transportation and school safety programs.

Instead, you are going to look at the unique challenges that your school faces, the unique talents and resources that your school has, and we are going to appropriate all the money to you. You are the professionals and all we are going to do is judge the outcomes. Do the kids improve in their reading scores? Do they improve in their math scores?

Now, the tendency in States where they go to this reform continues to be on inputs. You want to say, oh, well, we should at least say every school ought to have a school breakfast program. We ought to at least say every school should have this. And it is very hard. It is going to be very hard for us to discipline ourselves to stop cutting up the education pie into teacher training and into gender equity programs and so on and instead say the outcome better produce results. Poor kids better do as well as rich kids. Women better do as well as men. The kids better read better than they do now. It is going to be very hard to discipline ourselves not to cut that up.

At the same time, we are all going to be visited by a hundred different groups that currently have a particular program that has its name on it when it leaves Washington, D.C., that is going to be opposed. ``You can cut out all the other programs and you can provide flexibility with all the other dollars, but my program, the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program that happens to be located at my school of education, it is the one program you should keep in place and keep sending money to.''

This is going to be hard for us. But if we are serious that we are going to change our approach to education, we are going to have to discipline ourselves not to be an input-based system--you can't have it both ways--but to go to an outcome-based system. It is tough. But all the progress we have seen so far has come from giving that discipline at the State and now at the Federal level.

SPENDING VS. RESULTS

Mr. Hickok. Those same people have been knocking on my door

for the last several months asking me to make sure we fund this or that.

Two observations, if I might. The measure of our commitment to education should not be measured or should not be taken only in dollars but in results. What a tragedy it would be if we as a Nation tripled our spending on education and nothing happened to that red line. The red line on that chart should be our goal. That should be our measure of success, not how many dollars are spent. As I said earlier, when we see results, it will make spending decisions easier to make.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. Hoyer mentioned the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is being zeroed out. I am aware of no study, at least so far, that analyzes the relationship between national board certification and student achievement. For me, professional certification should result in student achievement and improvement. That is what teaching is all about. It shouldn't merely be a process that makes me feel better as a teacher.

I want to feel good as a teacher, and if I feel better by going through a process, that is nice, but what should make me feel good is a teacher whose students are learning better than they did before. That is why it isn't supported in that budget.

Mrs. Northup. Let me comment. In Kentucky, the proposal was, that we allow that to take the place of getting a graduate or postgraduate degree. So doesn't the National Board Certification have the incentive? I mean, they make money by every teacher that comes and gets certified. If you make it so hard that it is harder than going to school and getting a graduate degree, then nobody will come. So it is very hard to have quality control.

I am not saying that that happened. It is difficult when you get States that allow teachers to forgo their graduate degree or their post graduate degree and instead allow them to get their national certification. You know, States can do that, but they ought to have high quality standards--basically, like you said, if they don't get better students from it, then why are we spending money on it?

Somebody said, have we ever thrown money? We have thrown money. We threw money when we threw money at 100,000 new teachers. Ask anybody to show me the outcry from eliminating the 100,000 new teachers. We knew when it was funded it was throwing money. We just had a politician that wanted it. And since we have started to ratchet it down there is nobody--not teachers, not school districts, nobody--that is saying, ``That was the most fabulous program; it changed lives in my district.'' We threw money at it.

That wasn't the only program we were asked to throw money at, and it did happen. And for anybody to act outraged is to ignore the truth.

Mr. Regula. Well, I believe that your objective is outputs, and you are trying to establish a system whereby people can measure outputs. And inputs don't--they might, obviously, have an impact. But what the parent of that child wants is an output. He wants his or her child to be well educated.

Mr. Sherwood, if you had known all these things, you might not have run for the school board.

CHALLENGES IN EDUCATION

Mr. Sherwood. I could have got it done in 10 years instead of 19 and a half.

Secretary Hickok, Secretary Neuman, I think it is quite obvious to you that there are some differences of opinion on this side of the table and that I wish my colleagues had stayed because I wanted to address the fact that I thought they very artfully worked into the testimony today that it was their opinion that you were responsible for hiring teachers and building school buildings. And we don't think that is the case.

You know, I spent a good deal of my free time for 19 and a half years making sure my local school district got new buildings and hired good teachers, and it has to be run on a case-by-case basis. If you can run a 240-square-mile district in northeastern Pennsylvania that has high free and reduced school lunch numbers and a low tax base, you can do it in lots of places. We have a system now that doesn't have a building older than 25 years and runs pretty well, but we are not nearly good enough.

We need the right type of stimulus from the top, and I think that is what the President is doing. He has very much increased the national debate on education, and it is obvious that that is what the voters wanted to hear, and we were glad to see him in schools and glad to see him paying attention.

Results are what we are looking for, and we are guilty of throwing money at problems, whether we want to admit it or not. It is the easy thing to do from here. It is a breath of fresh air that you are telling us that throwing more money at it doesn't necessarily lift the bar, and I think you are to be commended for that.

One thing I would like to say is that school superintendents in my district, and we called around before the hearing, are a little concerned that they and their Federal coordinators don't yet have enough information about the No Child Left Behind reforms, and they'd like to get more information. How are you getting out the word to the LEAs? I think that is--whether we are talking about health care or education or whatever the discipline is that comes before this committee, we often think that there is a little disconnect between what we know in the center of the research and what we get out and get applied.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND BEHIND IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Hickok. We have a multidimensional campaign under way, for lack of a better term, to get the word out. Two days after the President signed the bill into law, we had the State Chiefs over to Mount Vernon. I think 30 or so of them were able to attend. It is the first time in the history of the Department, as I understand, that after ESEA signing the Secretary of Education invited and sat down with the leaders of the State education systems.

It was really quite an event. For 2 days we discussed the law, to give them information. We gave them a booklet bigger

than this that gave them details of what the law is all about.

We had similar meetings with the governors and the superintendents of the Nation's largest school districts.

In addition, we have gone across the country, frankly, working with our regional offices. We have 10 regional offices making sure that they have materials that they are disseminating.

Of course, this conversation continues, because the law was passed 3 months ago. It is a very complex piece of legislation, as you know. It is this thick. So the guidance and the regulations--we try to issue more guidance than regulations--are being developed on a daily basis. Things are going out all the time.

In addition, Susan has been working with her staff and with local and State education officials on various aspects of this.

You mentioned the reading academies that have been successful. We are getting ready to publish sort of a users' guide for policymakers and decisionmakers on this law.

So it has been a real challenge because we don't have much time. The school year starts before you know it. Most of our effort has been getting this information out there in a variety of different ways.

Ms. Neuman. I will just add--Gene touched on most of the key things that we have been doing, but we are lucky enough to have the Web now. As soon as our guidance is developed, as soon as our draft regulations are developed, they go up on the Web. So we have been trying to really be responsive, because we know so many people have questions.

The other thing is we are having three major Title I meetings regionally starting this summer which really focus on some of the key issues that we haven't had a chance to talk about today: the importance of supplemental services, of public school choice, of transportation issues. Many of those key issues will be discussed at those conferences.

We are about to start our regional meetings which are regional outreach meetings, talking about the negotiated rulemaking process.

So we have been very, very active in trying to get the word out in those ways.

Mr. Sherwood. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hickok. If you go to the Department's Web site, we now have--it started Monday--a Web site devoted entirely to No Child Left Behind. It is a Web site that we think is pretty dramatically different from traditional Government Web sites. Because our goal here is to engage all the people, not just educators--parents, school board members, taxpayers, employers--get them the information so they can understand the potential here, in a way that really is much more accessible.

Ms. Neuman. I feel like I am in elementary school.

Mr. Sherwood. So do we.

Mr. Regula. Any further comments?

Off the record.

[Discussion held off the record.]

Mr. Regula. All the money results in Johnny or Mary having more skills when they leave the school. The success of this is vital to the Nation's future, and I don't think that the effort to slow down the dropout rate will succeed until we give

children a better sense of achievement. I think a lot of dropouts are because they are frustrated, and then there is peer pressure. John drops out, so Bill says, by golly, if John goes, I go. Because teenagers respond a lot to peer pressure. That is a tragic loss of human capital.

So we have had an interesting debate here this morning. You have some really tough challenges, and we do, too, in trying to structure this. What we hope we can do as a committee is to make, prioritywise, the best use of the money available. Because it is considerably more on taking the 2-year budget, and we hope that it results in better education.

Thank you for coming. God speed in what you are doing.

The committee is adjourned.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Wednesday, April 17, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WITNESSES

SUSAN B. NEUMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION

ROBERT H. PASTERNAK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

GROVER J. WHITEHURST, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND
IMPROVEMENT

WADE F. HORN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Introduction of Witnesses

Mr. Regula. Okay. We will get started this morning. We look forward to the testimony on Foundations for Learning. That is a rather interesting topic, and so I think it would be helpful to the committee to get an insight into what we do. Foundations for Learning could cover a lot of territory.

It is my understanding and I have the following order of witnesses that will make presentations: Susan Neuman, Bob Pasternack, Russ Whitehurst and Wade Horn. Is that the understanding? Okay.

Well, Susan, you get to lead off. In the case of all of you, your full statements will be in the record, and we appreciate your summarizing.

Opening Statement of Susan B. Neuman

Ms. Neuman. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss the President's 2003 budget for programs administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education that focus on providing our Nation's young children with the foundation they will need

to achieve academically. Of the Department's many elementary and secondary programs, none are more critical than the programs that affect children's early learning.

Three days after taking office, President Bush announced No Child Left Behind, his framework for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. One of the President's highest priorities is helping States and local communities to ensure that all children learn to read by the end of third grade. The Reading First State Grants program will help States and school districts apply rigorous, scientifically-based reading research to accomplish that goal. By effectively teaching all children to read well by the end of grade 3, we can ensure that all children advance to later grades well prepared to achieve their full academic potential. Reading First will help States and school districts establish research-based reading programs for students in kindergarten through third grade. It will provide significantly increased professional development so that all teachers have the skills they need to teach effectively.

The program will also prepare teachers to focus on screening, identifying, and overcoming reading barriers that face our children. Reading First focuses on what works, and it will put and support proven methods of early reading instruction in classrooms.

The Administration is requesting \$1,000,000,000 for Reading First for fiscal year 2003, \$100,000,000 above the 2002 appropriation. The Early Reading First program, for which the Administration is requesting \$75,000,000 in fiscal 2003, complements Reading First. The program will help children in preschool programs enter kindergarten with early language and cognitive skills necessary for reading success, thereby preventing many later reading difficulties. Early Reading First aims to transform early learning programs supported by Title I, Head Start, and Even Start, so that young children enter school ready to learn to read. Early Reading First focuses on scientifically based evidence and shows that the most effective way to provide instruction and prereading skills for young children is to ensure professional development for all of our teachers.

We propose that learning environments will be rich in age-appropriate print from resources such as books, labeling, posting the alphabet, and children working in prewriting and developmental phonics. Teachers will deliver intentional and explicit instruction and conduct progress monitoring to determine which skills children are learning.

In addition, about half of the participants in the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program are in grades pre-K through grade 3, and reading is a major focus of Title I-funded activities at this level.

In addition, the Even Start program, for which the Administration is requesting \$200,000,000, supports projects that provide educational services to low-income families, including parents eligible for adult education services, and their children from birth through age 7. This program integrates early childhood education, adult education, and parenting education.

And, finally, the Early Childhood Educator Professional

Development Program provides professional development opportunities to early childhood educators to promote school readiness, to further children's skills and to help prevent them from encountering difficulties once they enter school. The Administration is requesting \$15,000,000 for this program.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. My colleagues and I would be happy to respond to any questions that you may have.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Thank you. Mr. Pasternack.

Opening Statement of Robert H. Pasternack

Dr. Pasternack. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the invitation to be here, and thank you for your support of our programs at the U.S. Department of Education for a very long time.

I want to begin by applauding your conceptual approach to these hearings. Those of us who work with children with disabilities are aware of the real importance of including the needs of kids with disabilities in every policy that we make. So, the attempt that you have made this morning to include a variety of policymakers on the same panel to address issues affecting very young children, I think, is critically important and I want to applaud you for doing that. It is the same approach we are trying to take to policymaking that is happening at the Department. We do not believe we are ever going to improve special education by focusing only on special education. These are not issues about special education or general education. These are issues that affect kids, and we have got to approach it in that way. So, I want to thank you for structuring the hearing in this manner.

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

My message is very simple, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. Early intervention works. We have known that for a long period of time. The earlier we can identify kids with disabilities and identify kids at risk of developing disabilities, the earlier we can provide targeted interventions that are scientifically based and change their life trajectories from risk to resiliency.

I am also proud to tell you that the First Lady is acutely aware of these issues, as you know, Mr. Chairman. She has been a passionate and articulate spokesperson for the need to do more to meet the cognitive, linguistic, social, and emotional developmental needs of very young children, and I am proud of her support of those programs.

I want to finish by telling you that, from our perspective at the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, there are a few things that are very important in these early childhood programs. One is that they be family-focused and that we have an opportunity to meet the needs of family systems that

are adversely impacted when families have a child with a developmental disability born into that family. It has a devastating impact, as you know, and the services that we can provide through Part C allow us to address the entire family system in a comprehensive and coordinated way.

Mr. Regula. Aren't they often first identified when the child gets into the education system, kindergarten, first grade? Isn't that where they tend to identify the disability if it is not a child that is physically handicapped, but a child that has a mental problem?

EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Dr. Pasternack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Clearly, the overwhelming majority of students who exhibit academic and behavioral difficulties get identified in schools. As a matter of fact, about half of the 6\1/2\ million kids that we have in special education are in the category of specific learning disability. Up to 80 to 90 percent of those kids have a reading disability. Unfortunately, we are identifying those kids too late. We are identifying those kids between the age of 11 and 17 when the research tells us that we need to identify these children at a much younger age. Through the work we are doing at the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and Reading First and Early Reading First, we hope to change that and begin to identify kids much younger. However, through Part C of the IDEA, which is our program that supports services from birth through age 2, we are able to identify many children with significant disabilities at a very early age, some as early as infancy, and begin to target interventions at that age. For example, with kids who are blind, who are deaf, kids who have significant physical disabilities like spina bifida, there are newborn screening programs that can identify those disabilities and offer interventions to those kids at infancy.

Secondly, sir, we use a multi-disciplinary approach in our early childhood programs because then we are able to have a variety of professionals involved and coordinate the services that are required. It also is an interagency approach that we are using through the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council which provides advice to a variety of Cabinet agencies on issues affecting the needs of young children with disabilities or at risk of developing disabilities.

And, finally, the services are community-based. With that, given the brief nature of the opening remarks, I will be happy to answer any questions that you or Members of the Committee have.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Thank you. Dr. Whitehurst.

Opening Statement

Dr. Whitehurst. Mr. Chairman, Members of the committee,

before coming to the Department of Education last year, I spent 31 years doing research and developing programs on the foundations of learning, so I am particularly pleased that you have chosen to structure budget hearings around this topic and we are starting with it.

The shared understanding of the Congress and the Administration about the role of research and educational reform was evidenced vividly in the recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The phrase ``scientifically based research'' appears 110 times in that Act.

If we are committed to the goal that scientifically based research underlies reform of our most important education programs, then we have to address not only gaps in student achievement but gaps in scientific knowledge. There is simply a lot that we do not know and what we do not know does hurt us.

For fiscal year 2003, the President has requested \$175,000,000 for research and dissemination and \$95,000,000 for statistics in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. The request includes a 44 percent increase for research over the funds available in fiscal year 2002 and 11 percent increase for statistics. On a percentage basis, these requests are unprecedented. They reflect the President's understanding that education research of high quality and relevance is critical to education reform.

Today I will describe briefly some new initiatives in the areas of early childhood education and learning that would be supported by this budget. There are many other activities within OERI and the Foundations of Learning that I will not have time to address orally. They are covered in my submitted testimony.

PRESCHOOL CURRICULUM EVALUATION RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Last summer, the First Lady convened a White House Summit on Early Childhood Cognitive Development. One of the significant gaps in knowledge that was highlighted at that conference is that we lack rigorous systematic evaluation data to make informed choices among preschool curricula currently in use.

For example, the State of Georgia allows providers to choose among 7 different nationally available curricula. There is little evidence that would allow an informed choice among those curricula as well as choices among curricula that are not on that list.

In a few weeks, we will award the first grants under the Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research Initiative. These grants will support randomized trials of existing preschool curricula. We will fund scientifically rigorous evaluations to determine the effects of different preschool curricula on the skills and abilities that predict academic success in the early years of elementary school. We have been able to budget \$5,000,000 this year to get the program rolling and we are requesting \$15,000,000 for this coming year to move the program to scale so we can provide definitive answers to which preschool programs work best for which kids.

READING COMPREHENSION RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Moving to another area, we have launched a major new initiative in reading comprehension. We have learned a lot through research about how children learn to read in the first years of elementary school. This research provides the foundation for the Reading First and Early Reading First initiatives so no child is left behind.

However, we know far less about the conditions that enable those who have broken the reading code to be able to comprehend what they are reading. Through our reading comprehensive research, we expect to learn how students develop high levels of reading comprehension, how reading comprehension can best be taught, and we expect to develop new and effective ways to assess reading comprehension. We have invested \$4,500,000 to launch this initiative this year. We are requesting \$20,000,000 next year so this program can be funded at a level that is necessary to build a firm scientific base of understanding about reading comprehension.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Another very important issue in which we have a new initiative is in the development of English language reading and writing competencies among children whose first language is not English. Demographic shifts and changes in immigration are resulting in an increasing number of children in American schools whose first language is not English. Many of these children come from low-income homes and often their parents have little formal education. In 2001, the Department of Education and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development jointly funded research designed to identify critical factors that can enhance the reading and writing skills of ESL children. The 2003 competition will broaden this initiative by soliciting proposals addressing the instruction needs of other populations of second language learners. We are investing \$3,300,000 in this program this year and are requesting an increase of \$6,300,000 for the program next year.

WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE

Finally, let me mention our new initiative called What Works Clearinghouse. Since research cannot transform educational practice if it is known only to researchers, our budget request includes funding to translate research findings into user-friendly formats and to disseminate this information to parents, teachers and policymakers. We intend to create a trusted source for information on what works in education. Virtually all education products, curricula, and approaches are currently advertised as based on research, but few are. What Works Clearinghouse will specify clear and rigorous methodological standards for a demonstration or a program effectiveness and will describe the quality and quantity of evidence on the effectiveness of various programs and approaches within subject areas. Over time, the clearinghouse will become the principal source of valid information on effective educational practice.

Let me thank you again for the opportunity to testify in support of research in the Foundations of Learning. My colleagues and I will be happy to respond to any questions that you may have.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

EARLY CHILDHOOD INITIATIVES

Mr. Regula. Mr. Horn.

Mr. Horn. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my thanks to your vision in holding this hearing on this particular topic. As a clinical child psychologist, I, too, spend my career working in the area of childhood and trying to improve things for kids. And my dissertation a number of years development ago, when I had hair and could read without glasses, was on predicting school failure, and my minor concentration was in special education. So I applaud you and the rest of the Members of this committee in holding this hearing.

As demonstrated by the President's recently announced early childhood initiatives, the administration is moving quickly in a collaborative fashion to apply the latest research to improve early childhood and childcare programs and to generate new knowledge about what works best in the early learning years. And in this vein I wanted to convey my strong commitment to working with you and my colleagues from the Department of Education to improve the healthy development and school-readiness of our Nation's young children. My testimony today will focus on our most recent research findings and how we are using this knowledge to improve the quality and effectiveness of Head Start and childcare programs.

A note from the Department of Education's 1998 Early Childhood Longitudinal Study on which the Administration for Children and Families collaborated stated that children from low income families perform at significantly lower levels in reading and mathematics in kindergarten and first grade than children from nonpoor families. This clear evidence of an overall achievement gap led to the President's new efforts to improve early childhood programs, including Head Start. Head Start is implementing a research agenda designed to identify and implement state-of-the-art approaches to advancing children's progress in all dimensions of school readiness.

For example, the Head Start Family and Child Experience Survey, known as FACES, is an ongoing longitudinal study of Head Start programs providing national data on Head Start child outcomes, family involvement, key aspects of program quality and teaching practices. Newly available findings from FACES demonstrates that while Head Start children do show progress, we must do more to ensure that these children enter kindergarten with strong early literacy skills. But Head Start makes positive contributions to the lives of thousands of children and families.

We must integrate new research findings about early childhood learning into the program if it is to achieve its

full potential. This shift in focus can and should be accomplished without sacrificing the comprehensive nature of the program.

Recently the President announced a major new step in this direction. The Good Start Grow Smart early childhood Initiative will have a very positive impact on strengthening the early literacy component in Head Start and childcare. As part of this initiative to improve teaching and learning outcomes, Project STEP (Summer Teacher Education Program), an intensive national teacher training effort in early literacy, is planned to begin this summer. Through this systematic nationwide training effort, we will increase the knowledge of all Head Start teachers in using the latest research on how children develop early literacy and language skills.

Along with our increased investment in teacher training, the President is calling for improved efforts to keep track of what Head Start children are learning and to use information on child outcomes to guide program improvement and accountability efforts. For the first time every Head Start center will be held accountable for special standards of learning or specific standards of learning in early literacy, language and numeracy skills.

Further, we will be designing a national reporting system to collect child outcome data from every local program. At the same time we must continue our efforts to learn more about what is needed to comprehensively prepare children for early school success. The Administration for Children and Families is collaborating with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and the Department of Education and other DHS agencies on a \$45,000,000, 5-year initiative to fill this gap in knowledge.

We are also taking steps to work with States in their planning and management of Federal childcare funds to improve program quality and children's early learning.

The President's plan asks States to develop quality criteria for early childhood education. We will work actively with the States to focus on incorporating these early literacy guidelines in their childcare programs.

In addition, childcare professionals from every State and territory will be invited to participate in the Head Start teacher training activity this summer to further solidify the focus on early literacy skills.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you and look forward to working closely with the Congress and my colleagues at the Department of Education to make the President's vision a reality in the years to come, to enable every early childhood program to offer the learning opportunities that all of our Nation's children deserve. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Thank you. The Head Start is part of the Department of Health and Human Services. Yesterday the

President announced that many children who enter kindergarten are not prepared, and the President has a proposal for literacy and language training for 50,000 Head Start teachers. Well, that word ``teachers'' is a new focus in Head Start, I believe. I understand he also proposed evaluating students and so on, and that his proposals have angered some Head Start advocates. What is Head Start? Is it welfare? Is it education? And how are you sorting it out as far as overlapping jurisdictions?

Mr. Horn. It is our view that Head Start is a comprehensive early childhood development program that ought to focus on the comprehensive nature and development of children. A piece of that needs to be a focus on the development of early cognitive and early literacy skills. We feel that is one area where the program could stand improvement. And so what we are interested in doing is, as I have mentioned in my testimony, implementing an intensive teacher training initiative this summer to make sure that they have available to them the latest research evidence about how it is that children learn and ways to incorporate that into the classroom, while at the same time moving towards implementing a system that will allow us to assess the progress of children in a variety of different ways with a particular focus on early cognitive development and the development of early literacy skills. So we think that Head Start has always been and ought to remain a comprehensive early childhood development program, but we need to focus specifically on enhancing the ability of the Head Start program to enhance the early literacy and cognitive skills of children.

Mr. Regula. You are moving from a custodial role into an educational role?

Mr. Horn. We feel that we need to strengthen it. The Early Literacy and Cognitive Development Act makes it a program, yes.

Mr. Regula. Do you coordinate with the Department of Education?

Mr. Horn. Yes, we do. And I sit on an interagency task force with two of my colleagues here at the table as well as others, both in the Department of Education and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in which we are looking at how to strengthen the early cognitive development aspects of not just Head Start but all preschool programs and childcare programs around the country.

Mr. Regula. Well, I have always felt that it belonged in education to start with, but that decision was made early on that it was a welfare type program, and I think we are in the transition, at least in the way it is managed, to recognize that education starts earlier than the kindergarten or first grade.

Are you developing, or the Education Department developing, any certification requirements for those who participate as leaders in the Head Start program across the country?

Mr. Horn. First, there is a requirement under current law that at least 50 percent of all the Head Start teachers must have at least an associate's degree in--early childhood education or a related field.

Mr. Regula. 50 percent.

Mr. Horn. By 2003.

Mr. Regula. How about the other 50 percent?

Mr. Horn. Well, we are working on them as well. But 100

percent of the teachers this summer will participate either being trained as trainers in the latest knowledge about early literacy development and how to incorporate that knowledge into the classroom or as trainees. The way we are structuring the training is that 2500 Head Start teachers will be trained as trainers. They will then go back to their local programs and train the rest of the teachers in each and every Head Start program in this knowledge, and then we will continue to monitor and provide coaching throughout the year to ensure that every Head Start teacher gets trained in this new knowledge, and is actually applying and implementing that knowledge in the classroom. Unfortunately, in far too many training programs, what you do on Wednesday is predicted better by what you do on Monday before the training on Tuesday than what you learned on Tuesday. So what we have built into this system is a monitoring and long-term coaching strategy so that what they do after they are trained actually is different than what they did before they were trained.

Mr. Regula. Isn't this going to add considerably to the cost to attract the people that you are looking for Head Start leadership?

Mr. Horn. We think that with this plan we will be able to integrate into every Head Start program the new knowledge about how children develop early literacy skills. We think we do have a skilled workforce in Head Start. We have been moving rapidly to increase their credentials. Currently 47 percent of classroom teachers have at least an associate's degree in early childhood education. We continue to devote funds to enhance both the credentials and education of the teachers in Head Start. And we have done a great deal to improve Head Start teacher salaries so they are more competitive with other programs run by the States or public school systems.

Mr. Regula. The States participate in the Head Start costs, do they not?

Mr. Horn. Some States do, some do not.

READING PROGRAMS AND TEXTBOOK PUBLISHERS

Mr. Regula. Ms. Neuman, in the Foundations for Learning, do you work with the textbook industry--does the Department have any liaison with the textbook industry because they would have to provide some kind of materials?

Ms. Neuman. We do not. We have had a number of conversations on what is scientifically based evidence and good reading instruction. We have talked specifically to early childhood publishers on what is scientifically based evidence in early reading instruction, and we have also talked to testing publishers as well. But we have no specific connection.

Mr. Regula. There has to be materials available for these programs that you described. Are they developed by the people that sell this stuff rather than working with your agencies?

Ms. Neuman. Right. We believe that the emphasis on early literacy and the importance of cognitive development is really spurring a great deal of interest among the textbook publishers, and they have asked us on many occasions for the definition and about exactly what we mean when we talk about Reading First and what are the scientific components of Reading

First. We are seeing evidence that textbook publishers are taking this seriously and they are looking to work with colleagues who really do know the evidence, who do know what is good early reading instruction, and new programs will be coming out. There are some programs already available.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

Mr. Regula. Do the teacher education institutions--I am talking about colleges of education, universities--do they ever come to you to say what should we be putting into our curriculum that will make the kind of people you need for these programs?

Ms. Neuman. Unfortunately, not enough. As I have said before, there is often a disconnect between what is being taught in colleges of education, including at the community college level, where they are still focusing in early childhood very much on the developmental aspects of childhood and not on the early cognitive aspects. We think social and emotional development is imperative, but we also know that cognitive development has often been left out because early childhood teachers are not prepared to know what content is appropriate and how to really convey it to our children in a developmentally appropriate way.

Mr. Regula. What can we do to get the colleges of education energized? Because that is where you are going to get your future instructors.

Ms. Neuman. We are trying very hard to talk to the colleges of education and to the National Association for the Education of Young Children about their standards and to the International Reading Association, whose standards become the critical standards for licensure in our programs. So if they become more rigorous and focus more on particular skills that are necessary, we hope that courses will be developed that convey that material.

WHAT WORKS GUIDES AND CLEARINGHOUSE

Mr. Regula. Well, lot of questions, but, Dr. Whitehurst, what works--you have a pamphlet or something that describes your initiatives and what works. How do you get it out?

Dr. Whitehurst. Well, this will primarily be a web-based interface with the world so people will be able to come there if they are interested in reading instruction or interested in social-emotional development or interested in safe and drug-free schools, they will be able to click on headings and find out what the latest research tells us about specific interventions and whether or not there is evidence that these interventions have worked.

Mr. Regula. Well, a lot of people that need it do not have the capability in their home to click on the Internet.

Dr. Whitehurst. We intend to prepare ``What Works'' guides when the research on important topics has risen to the point that there is enough information to synthesize it and distribute it through Department programs. The ``What Works'' guides will be in paper form.

Mr. Regula. Well, if we are going to leave no child behind,

we have to start with the parents.

Dr. Whitehurst. I think that is true. The ``What Works'' Clearinghouse is initially aimed towards decision-makers, principals, school superintendents, and others who are choosing instructional materials and curricula rather than students or parents. However, we will put a lot of effort into making the Clearinghouse user-friendly so that parents and students can use it.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Cunningham?

CALIFORNIA'S PROBLEMS WITH TITLE I AND IDEA

Mr. Cunningham. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have got quite a few questions. California is--and I am glad to see, Secretary Neuman, you are California-trained. And I think you met my wife, Dr. Nancy Cunningham, and she is now working for Bill Leidinger, Assistant Secretary for Management at Education, which will affect your committee. But California has got some monumental problems, in transportation, energy, water, and one of those is education. With population shifts coming from other States to California, with immigration, you can imagine the problems we have in IDEA and Title I and all the different areas combined. I think about one in nine Americans lives in the State of California. So ``hold harmless'' in Title I was very, very harmful to us. We were having children that were not being served as well as some of the other States because of the ``hold harmless'', and we think we have changed that.

My sister-in-law, Secretary Pasternack, is the Director for Special Education under Alan Bersin in San Diego City Schools. And if you need a resource there, one of the biggest issues that Alan Bersin, the Superintendent of schools, has--and he was a Clinton appointee, a Democrat but also a good friend, and I think he is doing a dynamic job with San Diego city schools--is with IDEA. Originally it was funded at 6 percent when--back in the early 1990s, and we have more than doubled that. But a lot of that--I also sit on the D.C. Committee here, and for two terms, I was able to cap lawyer fees under IDEA, which you can imagine was difficult. But each time we saved over \$12,000,000 that, instead of going to lawyers, went to special education. And we hired special educators in hearing and speech areas. We got new equipment for the D.C. schools. Unfortunately, the Chairman this year did away with that, but I am going to put it back in because I want the money going to special education instead of trial lawyers. But it is one area in which I think each time we increase money--and Alan Bersin's largest problem is he is losing good special education teachers and spending a lot of their time in courts. The zero tolerance that California has set up is very, very difficult.

Gray Davis, the Governor, has taken a lot of the money that we have sent him in education and is moving it now into the general fund to pay off his debts. I mean California has got \$11,000,000,000 debt this year. So a lot of those education dollars--and what I am asking is for you to focus a little bit on California because a lot of the special needs we have.

I also--I have got one daughter at UCLA who is bilingual--all three of my daughters and my wife are all bilingual in Spanish, but the other one at UCLA is studying to be a

librarian and is a writing major both in English and Spanish, and I was a teacher and a coach both on high school and college level and dean of a college before I actually flew in the Navy.

But this committee has got a monumental task at reorganizing and we have been trying to most efficiently reorganize the different branches of the Department of Education. 760 Federal education programs under HHS, under Labor, under DOE, and many of them are duplicative. Can you tell me what you are doing working with Bill Leiding on the management of your specific departments to make sure that we get the most amount of dollars to the classrooms and that the fraud, waste, and abuse that has existed under not just Clinton administration but other Republican administrations as well? I think it is time to treat it more like a business. But is that going to affect directly the elementary, secondary and the IDEA programs?

MANAGEMENT REFORMS

Dr. Pasternack. I will be happy to respond first, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Leiding, as you know, brings a significant background, not only as a pro football player, but as a city manager. We have been working very closely with him on a Department-wide strategic plan to not only deal with some of the issues that preceded our arrival in Washington, but also to implement some of the goals in the President's strategic management initiative. So, the short answer to your question is absolutely yes. There have been some significant changes made internally at the Department, including the way we process vouchers, provide travel reimbursements, and authorization of people with credit cards. We have heightened security, which sometimes makes it difficult to get in and out of the building for those of us who go in and out of the building frequently. However, we understand the need for security. For example, some laptops mysteriously disappeared in the past. So I believe that the kinds of improvements that have already been implemented are more evidence of our commitment at the Department to absolutely manage effectively.

We also understand the difference between leadership and management. However, we cannot lead unless we also have effective management structures in place. So, we are working very hard. Mr. Leiding brings a significant amount of skill and experience to his position. Certainly, the Secretary, in his prior role as superintendent of a very large school district, is acutely aware of the need to have very strong management. And we have been working very hard, particularly with the Deputy Secretary, Bill Hansen, to implement a strategic plan and significant changes to manage more effectively and differently than the way we have in the past, sir.

Mr. Cunningham. And the gentle lady from Connecticut went and spoke to my daughter's class at Yale, which is her district, and she called her grandmother and was all excited after your talk. But she wants to go into medical research, but she is focusing on women's studies and women's issues specifically in education and how women get to different levels. So we have got a strong background in education. And we would like to be of any service we can to you. And I am having

lunch with Secretary Leidinger and Secretary Hansen at noon, and if there is anything you want me to pass on to them, I will be happy to.

Ms. Neuman. I just wanted to add one comment, and that is that reorganization is often difficult. So in addition to some of the issues that Bob just spoke to, one of the things that we have done as a way of enhancing management is through interaction amongst us. There is a task force on early childhood, where all of us are working on research and filtering those programs with some of the same messages. Even though there are different programs, including Even Start, Title I, Head Start, a lot of these programs are going to begin to filter through the same messages as a way of really interacting and showing a stronger management base.

Mr. Cunningham. I think one of our biggest challenges in education is the IDEA program. It is between the parent groups and the school groups. Both sides have issues and we have to get our arms around this thing or else it is going to cut much funding out of our public education programs.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Kennedy.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for having this hearing, and it is an important hearing, and welcome to all the panelists. I know we have talked a lot about the need for literacy and early literacy. And I know that you said, Ms. Neuman, that there is too much focus on social and emotional development and not enough on literacy. However, I would contend that just because there is not enough focus on literacy does not mean that there is too much on emotional-social. Would you agree with that?

Ms. Neuman. I could agree with that.

Mr. Kennedy. If I could, because I do not have much time, the National Academy of Sciences with the Neurons to Neighbors revealed that you cannot have one without the other. You cannot have the literacy without the social and emotional. And what I hear you constantly throughout this testimony talking about is the importance of teaching teachers how to have cognitive--teach these kids cognitive development learning and everything else. But what I do not hear you talking about are toddlers like I have in my district, like Amanda, who are biting their Head Start classmates and are getting kicked out of Head Start at a record rate. More kids are getting kicked out than ever before. And what I do not hear you talking about is what we are going to do to prepare and address those children's emotional and social development. What are you doing?

Ms. Neuman. When I talk about early childhood professional development and the \$15,000,000 program that we are working with in early childhood education, one of the critical things that we know is that we cannot have one without the other, in other words, the social, emotional and cognitive. When we parse it, we lose it.

Mr. Kennedy. Well, the reason I ask you that, because we have in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a section called the Foundations for Learning Act which focuses primarily on social and emotional development, helping the parents in

therapy and family therapy, if the parents need therapy in order to be better parents--I mean first teachers because parents are first teachers. But that is not funded in the budget and I am wondering what you are doing to fund that aspect that you say is so imperative. Where is that in the budget? Would you show me where it is in the budget?

Ms. Neuman. In Even Start----

Mr. Kennedy. Even Start has been cut.

Ms. Neuman. Even Start has been cut.

Mr. Kennedy. And it has been cut and does not address the social and emotional development of these children.

Ms. Neuman. I beg to differ. Even Start is really designed as a high-quality early childhood program.

Mr. Kennedy. I am all for it. I want it increased. You have cut it. Where have you put the money for social and emotional development? You cannot tell me you have in an existing program that is not even meeting the needs currently of our kids that are getting kicked out of Head Start. Where are you addressing this problem?

Ms. Neuman. We are addressing social and emotional development in all of our programs. The key that we want to focus on is family literacy, which is a critical focus of Even Start.

Mr. Kennedy. Emotional literacy. I am talking about helping a child that cannot sit still in a class, and if they cannot sit still in the class, as all of you said in one way or another--not explicitly as I am saying it, they cannot learn. So what are you guys going to do to help those kids, identify them and help them with emotional and social development? And you cannot say it is spread out because we know that is not the case, because currently the funding is not there to address these programs.

Ms. Neuman. It is, in fact----

Mr. Kennedy. I will give you experts in the field who will tell you that it is not there. And I made this my focus for the last several years so I can speak from experience here.

INTEGRATION OF SOCIAL, EMOTIONAL, AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Neuman. I have spent over 25 years in early childhood and reading research. And one of the things that we know about is the critical integration of these things. One of the reasons that children across America have discipline problems in some of the early grades is that they are not being challenged. They are not being challenged intellectually. Our young children have minds that need stimulation. And one of the ways in which we integrate and help them is by making sure that social and emotional development occurs alongside cognitive development. It is within all of our programs.

Mr. Kennedy. You can say that stimulating a child cognitively will address their social and emotional problems. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. Neuman. I am saying they are integrated. I am saying that when a child is not learning----

Mr. Kennedy. When a child is kicked out of Head Start, what do you do with them? How do you propose in the existing program to address that child's needs?

Ms. Neuman. I am going to let Wade Horn talk about Head Start.

Mr. Kennedy. You just said you have got 25 years of experience. I am interested, because this is a serious issue, and you just told me that you can help these children by addressing them, by helping their early literacy skills that will somehow address their social and emotional trouble.

Ms. Neuman. I have not said that. I have said that early childhood development includes cognitive development. And that environments that are rich in print and rich in interaction with teachers, that provide children with opportunities to talk and engage actively with other children, are all healthy environments that support social, emotional, and cognitive development.

Mr. Kennedy. And I have not heard you when you talked about teaching these teachers to be better teachers--you talked about it in purely literacy terms. I never heard you say they are going to get a bachelor's degree and learn how to address the toddler like Amanda in my district that is biting other children. And I have not heard you address that, and that is what I am very concerned about.

EMOTIONAL, SOCIAL, AND BEHAVIOR ISSUES

Dr. Pasternack. Good morning, Mr. Kennedy. I am going to try to jump in here for a second because the kinds of kids you are describing are the kind of kids that might get referred to the programs that I have responsibility for. We do have a national project that is looking at behavior problems, which seem to be escalating in very young children.

Mr. Kennedy. That is the part I am trying to get at.

Dr. Pasternack. We are alarmed at the fact that the largest request for technical assistance by Head Start programs across the country is in the area of emotional, social, and behavioral problems exhibited by very young kids.

Mr. Kennedy. And that is why I am really troubled that I do not see any increase in any accounts to address that. I hear a lot about literacy and yet you have just identified the biggest challenge right now is social, emotional.

Dr. Pasternack. In our Part D programs, which include our national research agenda for IDEA, we are making some targeted investments to help build capacity across the country to deal with those issues. When I was a State director of special education in New Mexico, we enacted some State legislation that provided training to all teachers on the signs and symptoms of mental illnesses. As you know, the senior Senator from my State, Senator Domenici, has really championed issues around that.

Mr. Kennedy. I hope we pass that, Mr. Chairman. I think it will end up back in our committee.

Dr. Pasternack. I think it is one of the ways in which the special education system is trying to link with Head Start system and the early childhood system, because you are correct that there is an alarming increase in the amount of behavior problems that young children are exhibiting. Although on the Federal scale it is a small amount of money, it is a strategic investment of the Part D allocation that this Committee has

helped award to the Department. We have become good stewards of how we invest that money to help build capacity of Head Start and other childcare programs. We have an infant mental health initiative that we are looking at for this year, as well, because, as you well know, Mr. Kennedy, these issues often emerge very young. The earlier we can identify these kids, the earlier we can target our interventions to these kids, and the better the probability of us being successful. That is one of the ways that the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, HHS, OERI, and the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services are working collaboratively in a way that is unprecedented, from what I hear, to address the kinds of concerns you expressed.

Mr. Kennedy. I am really excited about what you are talking about and I am looking forward to learning about what we are doing and how we can do more on the Federal level and work with the Chairman and the Committee to give more funding to those areas because, as you said, it is an alarming growth. I think it is something that we need to address much earlier on than we are currently doing.

Dr. Pasternack. We will be happy to talk with you.

Mr. Regula. Would not Head Start tend to get more of these type problems, because Head Start is getting young people from homes that are not providing a high degree of stability, am I not right? It is not like everybody has to go to first grade or kindergarten, as the case may be, but only those that go to Head Start are identified as part of the poverty program.

Mr. Horn. Certainly Head Start is targeted towards disadvantaged populations, particularly economically disadvantaged populations. And Head Start also has a requirement to enroll not less than 10 percent children with disabilities, which also can include emotional and behavioral problems. I think one of the great strengths of Head Start, it looks at the child as the whole child. So the idea that we are focusing our training this summer on early literacy skills and integrating the new knowledge we have about that into the Head Start program should not be interpreted as taking anything away from the social and emotional aspects of Head Start, which has been a strength of Head Start for 35, 36 years.

In addition to that, under the President's proposal, we will be requiring that States as part of their State plans under the childcare program must indicate how it is that they plan to coordinate a variety of different systems that relate to early childhood development that can be childcare, Head Start preschool programs, but also I think special education programs and programs like Child Find.

IDEA FUNDING

Mr. Kennedy. I understand the budget freezes funding for IDEA school grant program, which you just said or the previous speaker said, that was the strength of your early social and emotional development, and I see that has been frozen.

Dr. Pasternack. We are asking for a \$20,000,000 increase for the Part C program which, serves children birth through two years of age. You are correct in that the Section 619 funding, which is our program for children 3, 4, and 5 years old, has

been at that same level of \$390,000,000 since fiscal year 2000. However, the increases that we are asking for in IDEA Grants to States funding, which is the largest presidentially requested increase in IDEA funding in the history of IDEA, can be used to serve children 3 through 5 years old if they are appropriated by Congress. These funds flow through to the States and then to the locals to enable them to provide the kinds of services that you and I know are required in order to ensure that students with disabilities receive the free and appropriate public education to which they are entitled under the legislation which Congress originally passed in 1975.

Mr. Regula. Ms. DeLauro.

Ms. DeLauro. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for being here this morning.

If I might--maybe the Chair and I disagree on this issue. I am of the view, and I will say it out frankly, that if our priorities were in the right place in this country with regard to education that we would have preschool education for every child in this country. Head Start certainly is not a poverty program and never meant to be a poverty program. Head Start or--welfare program. Head Start is about early childhood learning, and we need not turn it into something else, but only work to improve and expand on its success. It really has succeeded.

If I might just lay out a bit of setting, and I may be wrong, but this is the way I understand what is going on in childhood education areas. And I know that there is a Good Start Grow Smart Program, but what I want to do is try to take a look at the resources behind the early childhood programs. And as I say, as I understand it, this is the following scenario, that there are, in fact, truly no real resources to attract and keep qualified early childhood teachers or help low income families access high quality preschool services. Most of the early childhood education programs are frozen, Early Reading First, early childhood educators, the IDEA preschool grants, which is going to drop at the Federal level, as I understand it, per child on these children will drop to \$626, the lowest level in about 17 years. Programs have been cut like Even Start, which is cut by \$15,000,000 or by about 20 percent and that, quite frankly--I think it was said both by the Chairman and you, Mr. Horn, or at least acknowledged this, that this is the program that works with children and parents, and all research indicates that the parent is probably the child's most important teacher, so that we have cut the level of the ability of the Even Start program to deal in a way in which we believe is one of the primary conduits of learning for children, and that is through their parents. So the programs have been frozen, several I mentioned, cut, like Even Start or zeroed out, Foundations for Learning, the Early Learning Fund. Head Start funding is frozen in real terms and thereby it is the primary vehicle for early childhood education to poor children. And funding is sufficient to serve only about 60 percent of eligible low income children. Head Start teachers earn about \$21,000 per year, as I understand it.

And with regard to the budget, in terms of trying to credential teachers, provide incentives and investments, that there are not any real additional resources to expand

enrollment, enhance preliteracy curricula, purchase books, invest in teacher training or raise teacher pay, all kinds of pieces of trying to deal with that qualified workforce. There is--that is a basic picture of the funding level for early childhood education.

Now rhetoric is one thing, but in our business and in your business, programs succeed or fail based on the kinds of resources that they have. I want to call to the attention of the Chairman the FACES findings. This is the evaluation program on Head Start. There was a--this was launched in 1997, and it is an evaluation. Just so, Mr. Chairman, that you know this and you didn't get a copy of this, over the program year, Head Start children showed significant expansion of their vocabularies and early writing skills. Children leaving Head Start are indeed ready to learn because they learn a great deal by the end of kindergarten and, in fact, our graduates' improvement exceeded the growth expected of a typical kindergartner. Head Start graduates showed significant gains in vocabulary, letter recognition, writing and other pre-reading skills. Head Start children were performing above the levels of other low income children on the measure of vocabulary. So the evaluation literature is indicating that we are on a pretty good track.

Is there more to be done? Certainly. I would like to place into the record the testimony of Dr. Edward Ziegler, Ph.D. This is his Senate testimony in February of 2002. I say that because Ed Ziegler is probably regarded among a few others as one of the fathers of the Head Start program and as he says in his own testimony, ``Over the program's 36 years, I have become''--and this is Ed talking about himself--``become known as both its best friend and its most vocal critic.'' no one has been more critical when it is needed to be in terms of Head Start programs and those that were succeeding and those that were failing. In any case, Ed Ziegler has been involved in child development for 45 years. I am going to pull this out, but I would like to have this entered into the record.

Mr. Regula. Without objection.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Ms. DeLauro. ``As someone who has studied the growth in development of children for some 45 years, it is my responsibility to point out that reading is just one aspect of cognitive development, and that cognitive development is one aspect of human development. Cognitive skills are very important, but they are intertwined with physical, social, emotional systems that is myopic if not futile to dwell on the intellect and exclude its partners.'' And he goes through a whole variety of instances that if you do not have children who are not prepared to learn, they are not going to learn under any set of circumstances, no matter what your program is or what it is about.

So in setting the stage, if you will, for Head Start, I do have questions here, that it is a \$130,000,000 increase. That

will turn back about 2800 kids. The program serves only a fraction of the kids who are eligible in this country that we have deemed as eligible to take advantage of this program and that we are not willing to put the resources in this program that are required. There is no additional resources as I have laid out, according to what I understand of this budget, that would allow us to build on a successful model of early childhood education. Good Start, Grow Smart is out there. It does call for the training of all Head Start teachers in early literacy instructional techniques, accountability, measures that tie results to Federal funding. I believe in accountability. But there are all kinds of new requirements and there is no funding for this. How do we make up the shortfall for doing what we want to try to do? How do we plan on designing a standardized test to evaluate the needs of a program that is tailored to meet the needs of each individual community? Is there an assessment tool that is going to test all aspects of Head Start? Do we believe, given the comprehensive nature of Head Start, do you believe it is a mistake to tie agency contracts to performance standards? Who will be doing the assessing or training the assessors? We do not cover the cost of inflation in this program. How are we going to deal with all of the new requirements that have now been made a part of this program?

I guess, Dr. Horn, why don't I start with you.

Mr. Horn. First of all, the 2003 budget request does in fact fully fund a 2 percent increase, which is actually above the 1.8 percent CPIU index for 2002, which statute--which the statute requires that you link the cost-of-living increase to. And so we feel that there is ample money in the 2003 budget request to in fact provide for cost-of-living increase that is consistent with statute, even more generous than the statute, without sacrificing enrollment.

It is important to understand the budget, 2003 budget, in context of what is happening in Head Start since 1999. In 1999 the Head Start budget was approximately \$4.6 billion. And 2002, it grew to \$6.5 billion, a 40 percent increase in just 3 years. That is an extraordinary increase for a single system to absorb. And so we think it is time for us to pause and to make sure that those increases are being utilized most effectively.

Of that nearly \$2,000,000,000 increase in the Head Start budget over the last 3 years, \$1.1 billion, over 50 percent, was dedicated to cost-of-living increases, teacher salary increases and quality improvement. So--and all of that money, that \$1.1 billion, continues to be built into the base line of Head Start programs at the local level.

Ms. DeLauro. Suppose you have miscalculated the inflation--you talked about 1.8. Isn't Bureau of Labor Statistics talking about 3 percent?

Mr. Horn. Again this is for CPIU. And there is a distinction between the overall cost of the Consumer Price Index.

Ms. DeLauro. There are a whole variety of programs where we have had this discussion we talked about potentially, because Bureau of Labor Statistics has announced a 3 percent inflation rate compared to 1.8 percent from last year, so that if we are calculating on 1.8 percent, and we sure as heck haven't made a

miscalculation--but please go on.

Mr. Horn. Again, it is important to also think of this in terms of the overall 2--nearly \$2,000,000,000 increase for this program. There is also \$166,000,000 each year--actually in 2002, \$166,000,000 available for training and technical assistance. That is an increase from \$155,000,000 the year before. So we have additional funds available in 2002 that were undedicated the year before that we are going to be dedicating towards the President's Early Literacy Training Initiative and we think there is ample money there.

Even beyond that, we have an extraordinary flexibility in using all of the training and technical assistance funds. But we think this is not a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul. There is in fact a real \$9,000,000 increase in the 2002 budget over 2001 in training and technical assistance funds which will in fact fund our summer--well, in fact, our summer training program is estimated to cost about \$4,000,000. So we think we have got that covered.

In terms of your questions about assessment. I share a lot of your concerns, to be very honest with you. I think we have to be very careful about how we go about implementing assessment systems for preschoolers. But when we talk about assessment, it translates into people's minds of kids sitting at rows of desks filling in little bubble sheets and using a standardized testing instrument. That is not what we have in mind. What we have in mind is a process which we will work collaboratively with scholars, teachers and the Head Start community to develop an assessment mechanism so we can in fact understand whether children are making progress in the Head Start program.

The first piece of that will be a workshop we will bring together in June of this year which will start that process. Again, it is a collaborative process between researchers, scholars and the Head Start community. In fact, that is practitioners.

We then will use 2002-2003 academic year to field-test a number of different approaches to ensure that when we do assessments of preschool kids that we are doing it in a developmentally appropriate way. But in the end we do think it is appropriate to ask that Head Start programs be able to demonstrate that the kids and their programs are learning something.

Ms. DeLauro. There is no question about that. The issue is whether or not we are providing the kinds of resources that are necessary, one, in order to increase the number of youngsters, because I think we all start from a premise that Head Start is a successful program. I am presuming that you believe Head Start is a successful program.

Mr. Horn. I sure do.

Ms. DeLauro. And that we have succeeded. We are giving youngsters both cognitive skills and social development skills. There is not any reason to think that you, one, cannot improve on what we are doing. So that is not the issue. The issue is whether or not we are, in fact, moving backward instead of forward in terms of trying to provide the kinds of resources so that you can expand the numbers of youngsters that we are able to take into the process to be able to give them these kinds of both cognitive skills

and social skills, that we maintain our true--the true strength of the Head Start program, which is a development of the whole child, which has to do with parents and child development. And this is not a custodial program, this is a child development program, first and foremost, as it was conceived by the early founders of this program. And that what we also need to try to do is that we find--and I do not know what is being done with the material on all of the research that we have from some of the finest scholars in the country and the world on the zero to 3 information, that I hope we are not shelving that somewhere and trying to reinvent the wheel. We know today when kids and how kids are learning. If you talk to Sally Shay and the folks at Yale about reading and understanding that process, that data is there. We can research and research and research, but if we take it and we put it on the shelf and we say none of it is going to be turned into the opportunity for youngsters to take advantage of it and to make our teachers smart in understanding that data and learning it to be able to pass it on instead of trying to reinvent the wheel someplace else, then we are derelict in what our duties are.

Mr. Horn. I agree with you.

Ms. DeLauro. There is a heck of a lot of data there. What I do not understand is, what are the measures being taken to expand early Head Start and to look at ways in which--this is an area in which I am particularly concerned about and have introduced legislation, where are we finding the resources to get our kids from zero to 3 into this? Is there any money in these various pots that say we are going to have additional teachers trained for early Head Start and we are going to have so many more thousands of kids and slots available get into early Head Start?

Mr. Horn. I agree with you, first of all. We ought not to say let us not do anything because we do not have perfect knowledge. We need to use the knowledge we have and integrate that knowledge into the classroom. That is the point of the summer training program that we have set up. But at the same time we ought to recognize that we do not have perfect knowledge and ought to continue to expand our knowledge as best we can. That is the purpose of the \$45,000,000 5-year initiative to expand our knowledge through the National Institute of Child Health and Development about how children learn and what are the best kinds of curriculums that we can use in not just Head Start but childcare standards and other preschool programs. So we do not have any disagreement.

In terms of the budget for early Head Start, I do know that the statute requires that 10 percent of the funds for the Head Start budget be used for early Head Start.

Ms. DeLauro. So after you reach a certain threshold in the level of funding---

Mr. Horn. Right. And we are going to be at 10 percent.

Ms. DeLauro. Hopefully, if the inflation numbers are okay. Otherwise--well, otherwise, I mean if we go without early Head Start---

Mr. Horn. We do not anticipate we are going to have to cut kids from either early Head Start or Head Start program at all. I appreciate your passion on this issue. I share it. And what we are all trying to do is make sure that children develop well.

Ms. DeLauro. We are all trying to do that. And I think

there is--fundamentally there is a difference. When I take a look at the cutback in resources and the shifting of resources, there is a difference, quite frankly. And I am for--we have got a process in which we are evaluating and testing. We can continue to do that. But it is also not unlike the Leave No Child Behind program where we have passed it. It is a bipartisan bill. We did all we had to do. We took all the pictures in the world. It is \$90,000,000 short of the funding that it needs to be implemented. You, therefore--you, therefore, create failure before you get off the ground. And I am only suggesting that given that we are on the same track, that we have the resources that are needed, not in excess of, but resources that are needed to get us moving in that right direction and that we do not shortchange these vital programs. There are a lot of programs that we fund that are not vital. Preschool education, in my view, is vital for our youngsters to succeed. Should we do it the right way? Yes. But do not shortchange these programs. Find the wherewithal to provide the resources to be able to do what apparently we would both like to accomplish.

You have been most indulgent, Mr. Chairman, and I am appreciative.

Mr. Regula. And I appreciate your concern because there is definitely a need out there, but I will say that we have made a lot of progress over the last several years. We did not even have a Head Start----

Ms. DeLauro. Head Start was founded 36 years ago by several forward-thinking people.

Mr. Regula. I did not have any Head Start.

Ms. DeLauro. Many of them came out of New Haven, Connecticut and Yale University.

Mr. Regula. Mrs. Northup.

Mrs. Northup. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I was late. I had another committee meeting. First of all, let me say--I know I missed some of the earlier discussion, but I am disappointed that Head Start is not being transferred into Education. I would like to ask in my district, I believe that the Department of Education, Jefferson County Public Schools actually is a contractor for Head Start. In how many other districts is that true? Is that the majority of them or a few of them?

Mr. Horn. Nationally 15 percent of Head Start agencies and delegated agencies are public school systems. But that is an underestimate of the kinds of coordination that Head Start programs have with school systems. A lot of school systems, for example, provide space for Head Start programs although they are not the actual grantee of a Head Start program. It is actually based in the public school system itself. And every Head Start agency is required to have a transition plan between--so when their kids graduate out of Head Start, there is a transition for helping them transition into public schools, including transfer of records at a minimum, as well as discussion----

Mrs. Northup. There is a lot of coordination. I do not have a whole lot of time. I guess my concern is that I think when it started years ago, the idea was that socialization skills would help children get into school and be successful in schools, and I know there have been some studies which have shown that that

simply is not enough, and that socialization skills are not enough to help children to be successful academically. There have to be some skills that they learn that are directly related to how children learn to read. And my concern is what sort of quality control is in the Head Start program when schools are just refusing to address the skills that children have to learn when they are 2 and 3 years old, such as phonetic awareness and phonics, in order to be successful when they start at 5 years old in kindergarten?

Mr. Horn. First of all, we should not be satisfied with happy nonlearners, nor should we be satisfied with unhappy kids who know their alphabet. We need to focus on the whole child. But we do believe that it is important to integrate into the Head Start program the current state of knowledge when it comes to early literacy and early cognitive development. What we are doing is we are launching a summer teacher appropriation program in which we will, by the end of this summer, have trained all 50,000 Head Start classroom teachers in the newest knowledge about how it is that children develop early cognitive and early literacy skills. We will throughout the course of the next academic year monitor the implementation of that knowledge in the classroom, and for the first time we will be field-testing and then ultimately implementing a national system of accountability when it comes to whether or not these kids are actually learning something that kids ought to be assessed when they come into Head Start, in the middle of the Head Start year, and at the end, because you want to know where they are when they start, you want to know where they are halfway through, so you can make adjustments in the programming for that child. If that child is not making progress, we ought to challenge ourselves to do something different with that child so the child is making progress. And, in the end, determining where they are after their Head Start experience. And while we do not anticipate using an accountability system alone to judge whether a grantee ought to continue, it ought to be a piece of what we use in evaluating whether that grantee is in fact doing the job that the taxpayer and the parents of those kids want that program to do.

Mrs. Northup. So you are going to make the training available to all 50,000 teachers? Will you have any way of knowing how many will take advantage of that training? Is it coming across computer, is it interactive?

Mr. Horn. The way we have set it up is it is a trainer of trainers model. 2,500 Head Start teachers will over the course of the summer be trained, not just in this knowledge, but also as trainers. They will then go back to their local Head Start programs where they will train the other teachers in the program, and in that way, we will get all 50,000 teachers trained. We do not stop there, as I said earlier.

Mrs. Northup. What happens if the program does not exactly endorse that kids should learn sounds and letters and the actual Head Start program?

Mr. Horn. First of all, I am convinced that every Head Start center does believe it is important for kids to develop cognitively and they want to do it well. The problem is that they do not--they have not been exposed to the new knowledge about how it is that kids learn in the preschool years and the

appropriateness of having directed, systematic instruction with kids that is done in an appropriate--developmentally appropriate in a fun way. Instead, what a lot of Head Start teachers still have in their heads is this old outdated model that the best way for kids to learn is to be self-directed, and there are passive participants in this process as opposed to intentional participants.

Mrs. Northup. And as the previous questioner said, we actually know how kids learn. But would you agree that while we have spent more and more money on the Head Start program, just writing the bigger check has not been effective in getting that information to the Head Start programs?

Mr. Horn. I think resources is one way programs fail, and other ways, that they have the wrong knowledge or the wrong approach. We can spend a lot of money doing the wrong thing and we get bad outcomes. Good intentions are not good enough. They are better than bad intentions, but they are not good enough. What we ought to be focused on is whether or not we are actually achieving results with our good intentions, and that is what the President and Secretary Thompson have said again and again and again, we need to manage by results. What is it that we are actually producing with the investments that we are making, not just are we making investments, you know, because it all sounds good, but are we actually getting the results. And if we are not getting the results that we all want for kids to develop well, we ought to try something different. And I think what we need to do, and we have been working collaboratively with the Department of Education, is integrate this new knowledge about how kids learn into the Head Start program, not because we think the Head Start program is a failure, but because we think we can make it better.

Mrs. Northup. And I appreciate that. It is not with any hostility that I see it in Health and Human Services, but I will say that I am a strong supporter of holding our schools accountable. Strong accountability efforts. And one of the things we have got is kids who are not ready when they come to school and that basically, they are starting from a deficit, and therefore cannot be held accountable. I have to say you make a very enthusiastic and committed statement in behalf of getting results with the dollars and, in that case, that is fine. I am worried about the continued sort of excuse-making that goes on and the constant pressure we are under to spend more money on inputs because we cannot hold anybody accountable, because, by gosh, what they start with is a product that needs far more resources.

Mr. Horn. I agree with you completely. This administration wants to focus as much as is humanly possible on outcomes, not just on inputs.

EVEN START PROGRAM

Mrs. Northup. Let me ask a few questions about Even Start. I know that the dollars are cut for that. I wondered if you were thinking in terms of across-the-board cuts. I think somebody asked the other day, and the answer was that there were not the sort of results that showed that the dollars had made a difference. Was that in every way? Are there some programs that work and some that do not? Do we know what makes

a program better and would those dollars continue to go?

Ms. Neuman. I think our emphasis on Even Start is really to focus on what works. There have been a number of implementation studies that have shown how Even Start has been implemented, almost to mirror your comments before on inputs, focusing in on the inputs but not focusing enough on the outputs. Some initial research on Even Start suggests that we are not improving adult literacy skills the way we should and that we are not improving early childhood in the way in which we know will actually benefit children in elementary schools.

So one of the things we think is imperative is really to begin to look at this program more critically and try to create the opportunities to ensure that we focus on what works, to improve the indicators, to provide the social, emotional, and cognitive development in early childhood and to ensure that the adult literacy skills are stressed and that the way in which adult literacy is taught is better, so we really get the results we need.

Mrs. Northup. So what is your goal? To have fewer programs where the programs work? I am just wondering that if you are going to spend less, is it going to be that all programs get cut a certain amount or are there certain things you are going to continue to fund and certain things you are not?

Ms. Neuman. Early Reading First will create ``centers of excellence.'' It really focuses on where can we spend the money and see the results, because the results, enable us to replicate those centers of excellence all across the United States.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Does Head Start still emphasize trying to help the parents, recognizing that that is a vital component?

Mr. Horn. Certainly, it has been a historical strength of Head Start and it continues to be a strength of Head Start and focuses on the parents. In fact, we have recently expanded that notion to include not just moms as parents but dads as parents as well. What we are interested in doing is finding creative models of getting the dads more involved in the Head Start program and more involved in the health and development of their children.

Mr. Regula. How do you avoid duplication with Even Start, Head Start? Because the resources, as we have heard from every member here this morning, are limited. It seems to me that there is a danger in focusing too many different places.

Mr. Horn. There is always a danger of that. And one of the things that we are doing, as we have mentioned earlier, is working collaboratively across departments in a way that I do not think has happened in the past. It certainly did not happen when I was in the administration before. And the attempt is to first try to make sure that there is not duplication of services and better coordinate services across a variety of programs.

EARLY IDENTIFICATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Regula. I see there are 5 different programs that are focusing on this preschool period in a child's life. Dr. Pasternack, do the hospitals--do you work with hospitals where

there would be an early identification in the case of a baby that there might be a potential learning disability? It seems to me that the hospitals do some evaluation of a baby; am I correct?

Dr. Pasternack. Yes, you are correct, Mr. Chairman. We are working with the American Academy of Pediatrics to build the capacity of the pediatric community to do a better job of not only identifying kids with developmental disabilities and those at risk of developing those disabilities, but making sure that they understand the system that is in place across the United States to serve children birth through 2 years of age and their families, as you so importantly pointed out a minute ago.

COORDINATION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES

Mr. Regula. Is there variance in opportunity for early childhood programs from State to State, depending on what kind of leadership exists in the respective States? Ms. DeLauro mentioned how Connecticut is out front on some of these things. Is there a variance.

Ms. Neuman. Across States, very much so. There are some places that have coordinated services, for example, very, very well. In early childhood, in Georgia, they have created a center--you know how in some States there is a Department of Health and Human Services that deals with early childhood or childcare and the Department of Education often deals with Title I and the early elementary school years--and rarely do those two offices talk. In Georgia--I know this is also true in Massachusetts--what they have done is created an Office of School Readiness that enables them to combine services, and what that does is take into account social, emotional and cognitive development as well as creating a seamlessness between the early childhood years and elementary school.

Further, the Office of School Readiness has worked with the higher education institutions in really providing not only course work that enables----

Mr. Regula. Are you speaking in Georgia?

Ms. Neuman. In Georgia, but also to go in those classrooms and mentor early childhood providers and help them work on the ground with mentor-teacher relationships. They have had enormous success.

So I think the collaboration is really critical here.

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, if I could.

Mr. Regula. I yield.

Mr. Kennedy. It seems as though our flagship early learning literacy right now is Even Start, currently before these proposed changes, is that not the case?

Ms. Neuman. Not completely, Mr. Kennedy, there also is Title I preschool activities. There are about 350,000 children that avail themselves of preschool through Title I services. A wonderful example is Bright Beginnings in North Carolina, that has taken its Title I funds and placed that in a wonderful childcare service that really provides, again, social, emotional, and cognitive development in the early years. They have had tremendous effects in terms of their accountability.

Mr. Kennedy. The Chairman's question is to avoid duplication. It seems like we have a plethora of programs now

also seeming to do the same thing. We could have a program--one program that does literacy, like Even Start, and we fund that properly and expand it and fix it to find those centers for excellence that you point out, and then we could have the other programs like Head Start do the social and emotional part in addition to literacy so we do not have both trying to meld into each other.

Mr. Regula. But they all go hand in hand.

Mr. Kennedy. Right now you are borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. It seems to me that we are melding them all so that their focus has become blurred. That was my observation from hearing the Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Well, if you leave no child behind, that is a very significant challenge, because you are saying Georgia has an outstanding program--North Carolina. So that child that is living there has a better shot of getting his or her early years improved than in some other State where they do not have the leadership; am I correct?

Ms. Neuman. Well, we are hoping to take those places where we have seen real effects and again focus on results and begin to work with other States to make this happen. We are planning early childhood academies based on the Secretary's reading leadership academies that bring to bear all available information and to provide it to other States.

Mr. Regula. So you are a clearinghouse, in a sense, to say what works and share it across the country and hope that you inspire the governors and the legislatures and those responsible for doing a better job based on what they observed.

Ms. Neuman. Exactly.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF YOUNG CHILDREN

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, the former director, Linda Likens from Kentucky, is now--she was head of the Head Start collaboration director and head of what was known as this National Center for Family Literacy. All of her testimony and data shows that the Devereaux Foundation, which--is the largest nonprofit early childhood, mental health provider--says that they are increasingly getting the data that shows that all the early childhood educators are saying the biggest, problem is the child's ability to communicate their needs, their wants, their feelings; and they do not rank the alphabet as high. I mean it is important, but in terms of children acting out. And I wanted to go back to Dr. Pasternack saying we have a growing problem in our schools with these kids acting out in the schools, but not all of them are going to be referred to Part C. So that is what I am saying. It is good--and I support the Administration and applaud it for increasing Part C, but what happens to all the kids? I mean you cannot put them all in Part C. So how do you teach the teachers to help address the kids--keep them in the early literacy? Because we know from the studies, and the initiative that they did, showed that kids that can obviously learn, sit down and learn, are obviously learning more than kids that are up and about and running all around because they have not gotten this support. So I am wondering--what happens in the vacuum between literacy and Part C, what happens in the middle? Because they obviously are not

all going to be in that literacy part and--you cannot put them all in Part C. So what happens to the kids in the middle that are having those problems? How do you address that?

Ms. Neuman. I think that we would not compartmentalize. When I think of your comment about children needing to be more able to communicate: in order to communicate, you need words. In order to develop word knowledge and vocabulary, you need good teachers to communicate with children who actively engage them. And in order to actively engage children, you need to have something to talk about. And to do that requires a great deal of knowledge. Our children are not coming to school effectively ready for school not only because they lack ABC knowledge, but because they lack knowledge. And one of the ways in which they will learn and enjoy learning is by having a rich curriculum. We have not talked about the curriculum that is in preschools, but that is centrally important to how children learn. I would say that children who do not learn do not feel good about themselves. And one of the things we have not fully recognized is that these preschool environments are environments where social, emotional, and cognitive development come together so that children feel good about themselves and are prepared for school. To be prepared, they need knowledge and they need literacy and they need numeracy. They need social and emotional development.

APPROACH TO ADDRESSING PROBLEM BEHAVIORS

Mr. Kennedy. The challenge behaviors is what I am getting at, Dr. Pasternack. If you know it is an alarming problem in the schools these days, how are you addressing that?

Dr. Pasternack. If I may address that, Mr. Chairman. Briefly, one of the ways that we are addressing this issue is by supporting schoolwide implementation of something called positive behavior supports through a research project that we awarded to the University of Oregon using Part D funds. The researchers there, Hill Walker, Jeff Sprague, George Sagai, and their colleagues have looked at the characteristics of schools where you have decreases in disciplinary referrals and increases in positive behavior on the part of all kids. It is a schoolwide implementation model. That, to me, is one of the exemplars of the nexus between what we do that impacts kids with disabilities and how we can extrapolate from those studies to have an impact on all students. That is an example of where we originally looked at the behavioral problems exhibited with kids with disabilities. As you well know, many kids exhibit behavior problems, but that does not mean they are emotionally disturbed and does not mean that they have a disability. Even if the children have disabilities, there is a two-tiered eligibility model, as you know, that requires a determination, (A) does the child have a disability and, (B) due to the fact that the child has a disability, does that child need special education and related services? Many children who have disabilities may not need special education if, in fact, we can accommodate their learning differences in a good instructional program.

Mr. Kennedy. And that instructional program is what I am talking about. If you can tell me whatever you are going to do

to help these teachers become better literacy teachers--I do not know what it is called.

Ms. Neuman. Academy.

Mr. Regula. Get the information for Mr. Kennedy. I want to get on to Mrs. Northup.

Mr. Kennedy. Will that include teaching these teachers how to address these challenging behaviors in addition to literacy? That is what I am looking for.

Ms. Neuman. Yes.

EARLY INTERVENTION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Mrs. Northup. I will follow up a little bit along the same lines. I wanted to talk about special education. I will say, that it seems to me like you have to have certain categories. I will say, as a parent of six children, when Woody and I were married 33 years ago, we thought we were going to have the all-American kids that are going to jump on the bus and go off to school and come home with straight A's. And I actually know a few parents that have those kind of children. I think my husband had a right to think that. That is what he did in school. But I struggled a little more when I was in early school. There are those children that have learning disabilities that we know early intervention is important. I struggle a little bit because my children deserve their privacy. But let me just say that there is a strain of dyslexia here. Early intervention for those children in my family who went to a special school for three or four years, never had an untimed test, and had special arrangements made to them, graduated from college. One is in MBA school, and yet we have this idea about mainstreaming. And I am not against mainstreaming unless it involves every single class, you have every single minute of the day except for 20 minutes here or there. Intensive systemic intervention often means early identification and it involves critical help so that that child overcomes those disabilities. There is an ongoing belief nationally, based on what previous interpretations have been, that you simply cannot pull children out for intensive intervention early. Do you see that as being part of this solution, and are the parents in my district going to have to continue to pay outrageous amounts of dollars? We have three overcrowded elementary schools that are private and are extremely expensive, with a waiting list from parents who have kids that have been diagnosed as learning disabled and are reading way below their ability level and their grade level. They are waiting and trying to get into these schools, because our public school system believes they cannot have that early intensive intervention.

Dr. Pasternack. Congresswoman Northup, I know that you are acutely aware of the fact that we need to have highly qualified teachers with research-based interventions capable of changing the life trajectories of kids from risk to resiliency. The earlier we can identify kids, and the earlier we can provide scientifically based interventions, the better our probability of successfully intervening in the lives of those students. It shows up most acutely in the area of reading. With H.R. 1, Reading First, and Early Reading First, our hope is that we are

going to see a difference in the students that eventually wind up in special education. In fact, we expect to be able to differentiate between the instructional casualties, those students that could have learned if they had been taught by highly qualified personnel using research-based curricula and instructional strategies, and those kids with intractable reading problems, such as that small percentage of kids with dyslexia, as you point out, who need different types of instructional strategies.

Mrs. Northup. There is probably a degree here. I mean there is probably very dyslexic or a little dyslexic or whatever. But let me just say at least two of those schools do not have teachers that have gone back and gotten master's degrees. They trained them over the course of a summer for 6 weeks--a teacher that has been in a regular classroom--and they do great work. They changed the course of my children's lives. Children who could not go to a regular grade school after four years, three years, five years. One of the children was diagnosed at 3 as being borderline-retarded. He graduated from Miami of Ohio on time with honors. Now this is ridiculous and it does not take a masters' degrees or post graduate courses. It takes less than that.

And let me say too, in response to something Mr. Kennedy said, getting a little personal, one of our children was adopted at age 1. It would be far too painful to go into what happened between birth and 1 year old, but when I read in the paper that our superintendent 5 years ago was expelling 3-year-olds and people were outraged, I said I know what was going on there with that 3-year-old. This was a child that opened a speeding car door at 60 miles an hour and said, ``Either stop at the ice cream store or I am jumping.'' And from the day she walked in the door if you said, ``I am sorry, no,'' she went for the butcher knife. We thought it was autism. She is so fabulous today. She is 22 years old and a nursery school beloved teacher who does a fabulous job--especially with troubled kids. And she will say, ``He is a little annoying--you know, not as annoying as I was.'' And I think this is what you are talking about. The child at 3 years old. Maybe they are also born drug-addicted. A superintendent does not know what to do with a child that literally is destroying the classroom for every other child, and I do not think we have the research yet. The counseling, the support system, the advice. I mean there is nobody that can give parents, much less teachers, good answers. And yet the difference between what would have been and what is, is enormous, just enormous with the right intervention. I do not think Head Start has the answers for those kids. And I think we need profound research that gives us better answers on what to do with the child that a superintendent might be tempted to suspend at three years old.

Mr. Kennedy. I think you are right on. That has been the point I have been trying to make over and over.

Mrs. Northup [presiding]. And that is not dyslexia, that is not an active child, that is not a kid that feels a little beside himself. This is a child that has needs that are at a much different level of intervention and support. I would have written any check, any check. There was not a place to write a check that could have helped me through the stages that were

involved here. So I just want to say there is a big difference between a hyperactive kid and a child that has deep emotional problems.

MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES

Mr. Kennedy. And if the child's needs are not met at Head Start and if they are not met at school, and these are places--or Part C, where do the Head Start teachers and parents and the school teacher get the experience to know how to deal with that child's needs? And that is what I have been trying to get. Where do those kids--where do those families get the needs that they have met in this proposal?

Dr. Pasternack. One of the concerns that the President articulated in the New Freedom Initiative that was released his first month in office was the fragmentation in the mental health delivery system that currently exists in this country. The Surgeon General, who unfortunately has left public service, eloquently pointed out before he left that only one in 5 kids in public schools who needs mental health services is getting those mental health services. The state of mental health in this country is in crisis, and I think we have to do a better job of building capacity in our public schools to meet the mental health needs of kids because many of the kids that you both are speaking about are the kinds of kids that wind up in special education either with a diagnosis of emotionally disturbed or under the other health-impaired categories, ADHD. Kids are being placed in the juvenile justice system and adult criminal justice system in alarming numbers. It is becoming the surrogate mental health system in the view of many. So, I think the President is aware of this issue, and the Administration is working, as Wade said a moment ago, in an unprecedented way.

I just want to close by saying that one of my responsibilities is to chair the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council, which is under Part C and is a required intergovernmental council that advises nine Cabinet Secretaries on issues affecting young kids with disabilities or at risk of developing those disabilities. This year, we have identified two issues to focus on. One is the fact that families--I think you will appreciate this, Mrs. Northup--families with kids of disabilities do not have access to childcare. The second one is the fact that we have to do a much better job at meeting the health care needs of these kids and the mental health needs of those kids. Those are the two issues that the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council is going to attempt to work on. So, I think we are acutely aware of the issues that you have raised and are going to try to do a better job at the Federal level of developing strategies and programs in a collaborative and coordinated way to meet the multiple needs of kids so they can be ready to learn and can be successful in school.

Mr. Horn. In terms of Head Start, I want to emphasize again that although we have a focus in this particular summer teacher training program on early literacy skills, it is not at the expense of a continuing focus on the social and emotional development of the children at Head Start. We continue to fund a National Technical System Center focused specifically on

social and emotional needs of children of Head Start. We continue to do other kinds of training activities for teachers and other classroom personnel who will identify and be able to deal with kids who have social and emotional difficulties. I agree with Assistant Secretary Neuman that there is an interplay between a challenging curriculum and a child's comportment in the classroom. That does not mean that every child with a behavior disorder will--suddenly the disorder will disappear if we have the right instructional curricula in the classroom. But for a lot of kids, it will. But this is not at the expense of that, it is in addition to it, because we think Head Start needs to focus on this to integrate the most recent knowledge that a lot of my colleagues at this table have actually produced over the last decade or so, and we need to get that knowledge in the hands of Head Start teachers.

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you all for the fantastic work you did. I am as passionate, as you can see, as you are in this area. We have in my school system in Providence--our special education population for elementary and secondary education has increased 38 percent in the last 10 years. 38 percent. We cannot afford in this country to be paying these special ed costs. And I think all of these teachers tell me that a lot of it can be avoided, as Dr. Pasternack said, by getting these kids addressed earlier in terms of their families' situations and as the--my colleague said, a lot of these kids in foster care, how can you imagine these kids getting bounced around from one to the other. Overnight placements are unbelievable in my state. We are being sued for a number of overnight placements. How do you expect these kids to have any emotional abilities to settle down and get the support they need. And I am just looking forward to working with you to get that aspect done, and certainly literacy is a big part of it. But I just do not want us to go so far off on the literacy that we take for granted that real competency in addressing emotional and mental health needs is so important also. It is not like you have to have all Ph.Ds. Just have the Ph.D. Teach the teachers or teach the parents how to address it, and that is a resource I think we need more of.

Mrs. Northup. I think we have run over a little bit. And we appreciate your indulgence and thank you very much for the work you do.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Wednesday, April 24, 2002.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT, PREPARATION, AND DEVELOPMENT

WITNESSES

SALLY STROUP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
GROVER J. WHITEHURST, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND
IMPROVEMENT

SUSAN B. NEUMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION
ROBERT H. PASTERNAK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
MARIA HERNANDEZ FERRIER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
ACQUISITION, LANGUAGE ENHANCEMENT, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS
THOMAS P. SKELLY, DIRECTOR, BUDGET SERVICE

Introduction of Witnesses

Mr. Regula. We'll get started. We have an interesting panel this morning. I think it's an extremely important subject. Every time I give a speech to a group, I say, how many remember a teacher that made a difference in your lives? And of course, every hand goes up. But it's A teacher, and it ought to be every teacher. I guess that's our challenge, to make sure that we get good teachers.

My third grade grandson, had three possible third grade teachers. And even he knew which one he wanted. He figured out which was the best of the three. And it shouldn't be that way, there ought to be three best.

So teacher recruitment is extremely important. This is a subject of great interest to me, because I think that's key to a good education system, is a good teacher. And it goes back to the colleges of education and the way in which they prepare teachers. It goes to the question of how administration people provide mentoring and support for new teachers. And so I think it's an extremely important topic. If we're to have prospectively a good education system, we've got to have good people in the classroom.

And therefore, I'll be interested in what you have to say. I have, as most of you probably know, spent some time in a classroom myself and realize the importance of it. I wrote to two of my college professors and pointed out to them things that they had done 30, 40 years ago that I still remembered. And so teachers are a part of the education system, and we're interested in doing anything we can in our legislative proposals to enhance the quality, getting a quality teacher in the classroom. We do have the programs like Troops to Teachers and Teach for America, which have, I think, been quite valuable.

So with that, we'll look forward to your testimony. The order that I have here is Sally Stroup, who will be first, then Susan Neuman, Russ Whitehurst, Bob Pasternack and Maria Ferrier.

Okay, Sally.

Opening Statement of Sally Stroup

Ms. Stroup. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Regula. It's an honor to be here today to discuss the budget for the Office of Postsecondary Education in regard to issues of teacher recruitment, preparation and development. We face a serious challenge in improving teacher quality and enhancing the teaching profession to meet the needs of all students.

THE CHALLENGE

Teachers have never had to be as well prepared as they do today. At the same time, teacher shortages are particularly acute in high poverty areas, and in particular subjects, such as mathematics, science, special education and bilingual education. As a result, attention is increasingly focused on roles that institutions of higher education and States play in ensuring that teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills they need to help all students reach high academic standards.

In the past, a lack of collaboration between teacher preparation programs and colleges of arts and sciences and between institutions of higher education and the school districts they serve has resulted in too many unprepared teachers going into classrooms. Too often, new teachers enter the classroom with inadequate knowledge and inadequate skills to deal with all students in the classroom.

THE TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

To help address this particular need, we're requesting \$90 million for fiscal year 2003 for the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants program, which is authorized under Title II of the Higher Education Act. This program is designed to increase student achievement by improving the way our Nation recruits, prepares, licenses and supports teachers. It achieves these goals by providing incentives, encouraging reforms and leveraging local and State resources to ensure that current and future teachers have the academic content knowledge and teaching skills they need to instruct all students effectively.

Of the total request, \$33.9 million actually goes to States, for them to continue to develop innovative ways to improve the quality of the teaching force. This includes such things as reforms to teacher licensing and certification requirements, providing alternative routes to State certification, and developing mechanisms to ensure the effective recruitment and payment of highly qualified teachers.

\$46.7 million of the budget request would fund partnerships to implement a wide range of reforms and improvements in teacher preparation programs. These partnerships, which at a minimum must include one institution of higher education teacher preparation program, one college of arts and sciences, and one high need local school district, are designed to strengthen the links between the key players in the teacher preparation process.

Finally, the \$8.9 million remaining in the budget request would go to recruitment efforts. These funds would support innovative efforts by States and collaborative partnerships to respond to teacher shortages. Local educational agencies can use these funds to recruit highly qualified teachers, award scholarships for candidates to complete teacher preparation programs, support scholarship recipients, and provide follow-up services to former scholarship recipients.

OTHER EFFORTS TO ENHANCE TEACHER QUALITY

In addition to this one specific teacher quality program that's part of the Higher Education Act, the Department administers other programs that help strengthen the institutions that prepare teachers. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education supports projects that are designed to develop model innovative reforms and improvements in a broad range of postsecondary education areas, including improving the preparation of K-12 teachers.

The programs that address strengthening institutions and higher education, under Titles III and V of the Higher Education Act, make funds available to institutions to support a wide variety of activities that include establishing or enhancing teacher preparation programs. These include the Title III Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the Title V Hispanic-Serving Institutions and the other Strengthening Institutions programs. The budget request for this pot of money is \$462.9 million, which is an increase of \$15.8 million over 2002.

The President's budget also proposes a total of \$102.5 million for the International Education and Foreign Language Studies programs. The Overseas programs support study, curriculum development, and other academic activities in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers. These programs focus specifically on teacher preparation and development, creating a significant educational ripple effect as each teacher or faculty member trained under the program takes the experience back to the classroom.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL STUDENT AID AND LOAN FORGIVENESS

Finally, the Federal Student Financial Aid programs play a very important role in the recruitment and preparation of teachers. In 1999-2000, nearly half of the individuals enrolled in postsecondary education majoring in education or related fields, received Federal Student Aid. A quarter of those majoring in education or related fields received a Pell Grant, and a third received a Stafford student loan.

Offering student loan forgiveness in exchange for service is one way to recruit and retain qualified undergraduates majoring in education. In 1999-2000, two-thirds of all graduating seniors who majored in education had received Stafford loans at some point in their undergraduate career. Currently, those teachers who were new borrowers as of October of 1998 are eligible for loan forgiveness in the amount of \$5,000 if they teach for five consecutive years in a high need school district.

The President has proposed substantially increasing the maximum loan forgiveness to \$17,500 for mathematics, science and special education teachers at qualified low-income schools, because of the current shortage of those teachers in such low-income school districts. In addition, teachers who receive the campus-based Perkins loans are eligible for loan forgiveness under that particular program if they teach in high need school districts.

ACCOUNTABILITY

In 1998, when Title II of the Higher Education Act was adopted, Congress wanted to look at issues of accountability with respect to teacher preparation programs. Title II requires all institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs to report annually to the State and to the public on the percentage of program completers who pass State certification and licensure tests. The States must then report that data to the Department of Education, and we are currently in the process of compiling the first of those reports that we hope to get up to Congress in the not too distant future. This report will show the pass rates of the respective States for their teacher preparation programs.

Ultimately, public disclosure is intended to create a positive incentive for institutions of higher education to focus on important performance-based outcomes and for the entire institution to take responsibility for the graduation of well-prepared teachers for the classroom. While there are many initiatives at the Department that are designed to improve teacher quality, many of them in No Child Left Behind, these are the main programs in the Office of Postsecondary Education that actually deal with the issues of teacher recruitment, training and preparation.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear today, and my colleagues and I would be happy to answer any questions.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Opening Statement of Susan B. Neuman

Mr. Regula. Are each of you making a presentation?

Ms. Stroup. Yes.

Mr. Regula. Ms. Neuman.

Ms. Neuman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to talk about teacher quality initiatives today as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We now have compelling evidence that confirms what parents have always known that the quality of a teacher is a critical component in how well students achieve. Studies in Tennessee and Texas recently have focused on the importance of effective teachers in greater achievement gains. But we also have data from the 1960s that provide compelling evidence that children benefit from reading, math, and many of our subjects when they have high quality teachers.

All of our children deserve the very highest quality teachers. The No Child Left Behind Act calls for States to ensure that every public school teacher in the core academic subjects is highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. All of our new teachers will have to be licensed by the State, hold at least a bachelor's degree, and pass a rigorous State test on subject knowledge and teaching skills.

Reaching this goal will require reform of traditional teaching training, and it will require many of the alternate routes to teaching that we've discussed before.

Mr. Regula. This is a goal?

Ms. Neuman. Right.

Many of our States have alternative certification programs. As a Nation, we face many challenges in improving teacher quality and enhancing the teaching profession. The largest of our programs is Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, which provide support for States and school districts to develop and support a high-quality teaching force through activities that are grounded in scientifically based evidence.

The program gives States and school districts a flexible source of funding with which to meet their particular needs in strengthening the skills and knowledge of our teachers and administrators. In return for this flexibility, school districts are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified. The Administration is requesting \$2.85 billion for this program in fiscal year 2003.

The Transition to Teaching program, for which the Administration is requesting \$39.4 million, is intended to help mitigate the shortage of qualified licensed or certified teachers in many of our Nation's schools. The program provides grants to help support efforts to recruit, train, and place talented teachers in teaching positions and to support them during the first years in the classroom. The program focuses on encouraging two groups of non-traditional teaching candidates to become classroom teachers mid-career professionals and recent college graduates.

Troops-to-Teachers supports the highly successful work of the Department of Defense Troops-to-Teachers program. Under this program, the Department of Education transfers program funds to the Department of Defense to provide assistance to eligible members of the armed forces so that they can obtain certification or licensing as elementary school teachers, secondary school teachers, or vocational technical teachers and become highly qualified teachers by demonstrating competency in each of the subjects they teach.

The Mathematics and Science Partnership program supports State and local efforts to improve student academic achievement in mathematics and science by promoting strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary teachers, including the integration of scientifically based evidence and technology in the curriculum.

In addition, we have other programs that support improvements in teacher quality, including Early Childhood Professional Development, \$15 million; Teaching of Traditional American History, \$50 million; Early Reading First, \$75 million; and Reading First State Grants, \$1 billion. States may also use their Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies funds to improve teacher quality and enhance the teaching profession. In fact, for fiscal year, 2002 and 2003, the No Child Left Behind Act requires school districts to use between 5 to 10 percent of their Title I Grants to LEAs allocations to help meet this goal.

Mr. Chairperson, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Thank you.
Mr. Whitehurst.

OPENING STATEMENT OF GROVER J. WHITEHURST

Mr. Whitehurst. I'm very pleased to be here to be here with you again. I want to talk to you about the programs that are administered through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement that relate to teacher preparation, teacher quality and teacher retention.

About a month ago I was asked to give the lead-off address at the White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. To do that, I had to spend about a month in the late evenings and early mornings reading the research literature on that topic.

Mr. Regula. There is a lot of it.

Mr. Whitehurst. There is a fair amount of it. It does not address many issues that are relevant to preparing and retaining teachers. But the research that is available provides us some guidelines. So I'm torn between talking about the research and talking about my budget request. I'll try to do both and fit them together.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

One of the things that we've learned, related to what Susan Neuman just indicated, is that teachers do matter. Kids who have three bad teachers in a row have trouble recovering academically. Alternatively, kids who have three good teachers in a row demonstrate a permanent boost in achievement that lasts for years. Fortunately it's unlikely that a child will get three terrible teachers in a row. Teacher quality makes a tremendous difference in a child's educational trajectory.

The current approach to improving teacher quality is to focus on issues like teacher certification, licensure of subject matter knowledge, and related subjects. OERI's current research portfolio investigates a number of these issues. Our Consortia for Policy Research and Education (CPRE) has recently completed a very interesting study of mathematics reform in California.

One of the things CPRE examined was the effect of focused professional development activities on the ability of the State to carry forward its mathematics reform. They compared teachers who received focused in-service training--30 hours focused on the new curriculum--compared with teachers who received a comparable amount of training that was spotty and not focused on the particular curriculum to be delivered.

Those teachers who received the focused training changed their practice in the classroom, and the kids learned more. The teachers who received the scattered training that wasn't related to the curriculum didn't change their practice in the classroom, and the children's learning didn't advance. So, focused training does seem to make a difference.

Our National Center for Education Statistics is the

major source of information on how teachers are being trained, what their characteristics are, how they are distributed across poverty districts and economically advantaged districts. Relating to professional development, teachers report that when they have extended opportunities for professional development, more than eight hours in a year, they feel they profit from that and that it changes their classroom practice. Whereas teachers who report less than eight hours a year of professional development indicate that they don't profit from it.

We also find out from the schools and staffing survey that the vast majority of teachers receive less than eight hours a year of in-service professional development. I think this finding has clear implications for implementation of Title II of ESEA.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Another very robust finding from research, is the effect of the verbal and cognitive ability of teachers. Teachers who score higher on the SAT and ACT exams have children who learn better than teachers who demonstrate lower levels of cognitive ability. Given this finding, it is disturbing that the SAT scores and ACT scores of teachers who majored in education are significantly lower than SAT scores of students who majored in other fields. So, this represents a challenge to us, particularly when combined with the challenge we face of having to replace huge numbers of teachers over the next decade.

So how do we balance the need to be more selective in recruiting teachers in terms of their abilities and cognitive characteristics with the demand to replace substantial numbers of teachers? It certainly is going to be a challenge.

One strategy for dealing with these problems may have to do with compensation patterns. Again, we have an ongoing research project, the Changing Teacher Compensation Project, that focuses on the Cincinnati school system. This project examines the effect of a two-tiered compensation system in which major salary increases are dependent on teachers or schools actually changing their practices within the classroom. The evidence indicates that student achievement can actually be affected by a compensation package that rewards effective teaching at the classroom and school level.

TEACHING AS A SPECIALIZED ENTERPRISE

As I mentioned previously, one of the conclusions of recent research is that focused professional development makes a difference. Coaching a sport is a specialized enterprise in which you would not necessarily expect that the great football coach would be a great swimming coach. Similarly, I think we've got to conceptualize teaching as a specialized enterprise in which the skills and abilities needed to be a great reading teacher are not necessarily the same skills and abilities and training needed to be a good math teacher.

OERI'S NEW RESEARCH INITIATIVES

One implication for OERI's newer research initiatives is to

focus on teacher training and professional development in the context of studies of disciplines of activity. For example, in our new research initiative in preschool curriculum evaluation, we are focusing on curriculum. We are also focusing on what sort of training preschool teachers need to deliver effective curriculum.

Likewise in our new research initiative in the area of reading comprehension, the key question is how to teach children to comprehend what they read. In the context of this program, we're asking what sorts of professional development teachers need in order to be effective teachers of reading comprehension.

In keeping with these examples, we expect our research investment in the area of teaching to move increasingly towards questions of how to train and support teachers within particular content areas, such as reading and math, and with particular ages of children and types of learners, such as preschoolers versus English language learners or adult learners. We need the funding and the flexibility in our 2003 budget that will allow us to pursue these questions.

CONCLUSION

We are at the beginning of an exciting new period in teaching. It's one in which previous assumptions and ways of doing business are going to be questioned. As we build a solid research base on this topic, one that I think will be more specific than we have currently, we should be in a much better position to provide a good teacher for all learners.

Related to the anecdote that you started us with today, I have two children, one's in 12th grade, one's in 8th grade. As you know, in elementary school a child has only one teacher, typically. So for the last 12 years, my wife and I have sat down in the summer to try to write the magic letter that would get our child assigned to what we thought would be the best teacher for the next year, understanding that a bad teacher is not a good thing and a good teacher is a great thing.

What we need, I think, based on research, is to develop a new system for supporting the development and training and education of teachers so that every teacher is good enough to make sure that no child is left behind.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. So you don't have to write letters. [Laughter.]

Mr. Whitehurst. Exactly. So that my sons will not have to write letters for their sons and daughters to make sure they get a good teacher. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. PASTERNAK

Mr. Regula. Mr. Pasternack.

Mr. Pasternack. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you again

for the opportunity to be here. And again, I applaud you for the concept of bringing us all together to talk about these issues, since teacher quality impacts all of our programs and all the kids in America's schools.

As you know, and as you said at the opening, every day across the country teachers get up and try very hard to do their best to educate our children. In the programs that I am responsible for, the teachers need absolutely the best possible training and the best possible skills because they're trying to educate the most difficult kids in our system.

CRITICAL SHORTAGES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we have a critical shortage of qualified personnel in the area of special education. This past school year, the 1999-2000 school year, there were approximately 12,000 positions that went unfilled. School districts can't recruit or retain, highly qualified personnel.

Mr. Regula. What do they do about those, put temporaries in?

Mr. Pasternack. They put in uncertified people. And while I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and as I know you're aware, certified doesn't mean qualified--

Mr. Regula. Not by a long shot.

Mr. Pasternack. There certainly is a need for us to have the most highly qualified people working with the most difficult kids to educate. We're very concerned about what we hear from school districts.

IMPROVING TEACHERS SKILLS

On top of that, Mr. Chairman, another thing that we hear that's very alarming from school districts is the amount of money that they're having to spend on professional development. The teachers that are coming to them out of the universities don't have the skills that they need to do the very difficult job that we're asking them to do in terms of meeting the needs of diverse learners that they find in front of them on a daily basis.

The kinds of kids in our system, as I said, require the best prepared people that we can find. I want to point out just a couple of things that you may not be aware of, that point to the need for us to work together on these issues. For example, at this point in time, Sir, about half of the students with disabilities, out of the 6.5 million kids that we identify as having disabilities and receive special education, about half of those kids spend 80 percent or more of their time in a general education classroom. What that points to is the need for general education teachers to know more about meeting the needs of students with disabilities.

What we hear from parents across the country is that they feel that the teachers are not prepared to do that job, and that kids don't make the progress that parents have a right to expect. Congress has a right to demand, and the President insists that we leave no child behind.

HIGH TURNOVER IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

So, that's one of the issues. The critical shortage is something that we've got to do something about. And that's compounded by the fact that we have a high turnover rate. We're losing some of our best teachers. One of the national studies that we've been responsible for indicates that we lose some of the best teachers for three reasons. One is there's too much paperwork in special education. Another one is that teachers are telling us they're spending too much time going to meetings. And the third one is a lack of administrative support.

Now, those are things that we need to be seriously addressing during the upcoming reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and we look forward to talking with you more about that as we move ahead.

As my colleague Russ was saying a minute ago, we know that in order for professional development to be effective, it's got to be sustained, it's got to be comprehensive, it's got to be job-embedded. So we're really looking forward to working with our colleagues in the Offices of Educational Research and Improvement, Elementary and Secondary, Postsecondary, and English Language Acquisition within our Department, to make sure that we have a coherent approach to improving the quality of professional development.

One of our issues, as I said, is recruitment, another one is retention. Once we find people, we've got to make sure that we provide them with a work environment that allows them to stay on the job. And the third issue is making sure that we are working with school districts to help them deliver the best possible professional development, not only with school districts, but with our colleagues at the universities.

I'll just close by telling you that an interesting problem that we've just discovered is a shortage in special education faculty at the universities across the country. So not only do we have a problem in terms of providing high quality instruction at the pre-service level, but it's compounded by the fact that universities are having difficulty recruiting and retaining faculty in the area of special education.

Again, I thank you for the opportunity to be with you this morning, and look forward to your questions.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

OPENING STATEMENT OF MARIA HERNANDEZ FERRIER

Mr. Regula. Okay, Maria Ferrier?

Ms. Ferrier. Mr. Chairman, I'm truly honored to be here with you this morning to testify. I have been in D.C. exactly two weeks and I'm on my ninth day on the job. But I'm truly honored to talk about the development of teachers related to limited English proficient students.

The number of limited English proficient students has grown dramatically over the last decade, from 2.5 million to 3.7 million. And much of this growth has occurred in communities

and States with little experience in serving these children. Nineteen States actually have doubled their LEP population from 1992-1993 to 2000, in just six years.

A recent survey found that 42 percent of all public school teachers have at least one LEP student in their classroom, yet only 30 percent of these teachers have any training to prepare them for serving these children, and only 3 percent of those have a degree in ESL or bilingual education.

TEACHERS FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

Our 2003 \$665 million request for Title III funds addresses the need for more teachers in the area of limited English proficient students by including \$37.9 million for the National Professional Development Project to train new teachers and to give new skills to teachers that are already serving the students. Our request also includes \$64 million to continue professional development projects originally funded under antecedent legislation.

In addition, States can use up to 5 percent of their formula State grants under Title III for professional development. And school districts that receive sub-grants must use some of that money to provide high quality professional development to classroom teachers.

As you know, the Administration has also requested \$2.9 billion under Improving Teacher Quality State Grants to address the need to improve teacher quality for all children, including limited English proficient students.

My colleagues and I would be happy to respond to any questions that you may have, and thank you again.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

ADMINISTRATIVE BURDENS ON TEACHERS

Mr. Regula. I hear a certain dichotomy here, and that is that we need more professional development and yet teachers say that one of the things that frustrates them is they have to spend too many days away from their classroom. We can't have it both ways.

My daughter was a Chapter 1 teacher in Colorado. She said she got so tired of going to meetings and listening to the same old information over and over again. She wanted to teach. And I think that can be a problem. The second was paperwork. She ended up getting a masters in library science, and is a librarian in a private school, probably the best one in Ohio. But too much paperwork, too many days away.

I'm going to ask you a tough question. How many people at the Department of Education taught in a public school? Do you have any idea?

I'm going to ask the Secretary. I remember some years ago I made that inquiry. I wasn't on this Committee. At that time they said none. They couldn't identify anybody that had been in a public school. I'm going to suggest something that could be

heresy, and that is that I think maybe you ought to be the pool of substitute teachers for D.C. [Laughter.]

I was an elementary principal, I had 20 rooms for 3 years. Oftentimes, if I had a teacher that was ill, I substituted. So I was in every grade. And I bonded with those kids in the process. You need to be in the classroom. There's no substitute.

We have the president of Cincinnati University, where part of their teacher education program is a very intense get in the classroom program. But all these things make great statements, but it's really what produces--I want to ask you, on your compilation of statistics, have you examined the State tenure laws? Are they all the same? Do they vary from State to State?

STATE POLICIES ON TENURE, COMPENSATION, AND CERTIFICATION

Mr. Whitehurst. I can't speak to that specifically. I'll check and see if we have data on that. I know, however, that the tenure laws certainly do differ from State to State, and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. That certainly has an effect on management of school systems, as you would know from being in a position as manager and leader of a school system.

Mr. Regula. I had a teacher who had tenure, and it was the worst teacher I ever had. I couldn't do anything about it. It wasn't fair to the kids. Absolutely wasn't fair to those kids.

Mr. Whitehurst. I think one of the issues that the compensation system that I was describing speaks to is how to deal with differential performance.

Mr. Regula. You mentioned a school that had----

Mr. Whitehurst. It's a Cincinnati school system, and they've been experimenting with compensation.

Mr. Regula. How do they overcome the tenure laws and the union rules?

Mr. Whitehurst. I'm sure there was a lot of negotiation in the context of whatever the union labor situation is, to have achieved that sort of change.

Mr. Regula. Are certification requirements, do they vary greatly from State to State?

Mr. Whitehurst. Certification requirements do vary, but not as dramatically as you might expect. They vary by disciplines. And that's of great interest to us in the Department. We're particularly interested in reading. The question is, how does the training of teachers, pre-service training of teachers, and the certification that they have to receive, actually relate to what they need to know to deliver effective reading instruction in the classroom? We think that often there's a disconnect between the training and the exams that are needed for certification and the actual knowledge that's useful in the classroom.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION MODELS AND STANDARDS

Mr. Regula. Does the Department in its effort to improve the quality of teachers work with certification agencies within the States to see if they can develop better standards?

Mr. Whitehurst. We have an ongoing effort with--we're experimenting with other certification processes, particularly

alternative certification. Susan, do you have any information on efforts with respect to certification in particular States?

Ms. Neuman. As you know, we have a number of alternative certification models. We've talked about the Troops-to-Teachers and Transition to Teaching programs. We also know that Teach for America has very strong data indicating that those teachers who get involved in Teach for America, who are generally best and brightest, are those who then go into the schools and actually make a difference for children in terms of achievement scores, which we have to remember is our bottom line.

I think one of the things we have to hold teachers accountable for is not just being a high-quality teacher, but being a high-quality teacher who can convey that knowledge to children so that children's scores are increased.

So we have some models. One of the things the Department is trying to do very strongly is to support alternative routes. Because we know that the traditional way of certifying teachers is too slow and often not very effective.

Mr. Pasternack. If I may, Mr. Chairman, one of the projects that we're involved with is promulgating model certification standards in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers. This set of standards, for the first time, will serve as a national model. Now that those standards have been developed, we're going to release them for public comment and see what kind of response we get.

It's an attempt to address the question that you raised, which is to provide some guidance in terms of what are the skills that teachers of kids with disabilities should have. Those really should not vary from State to State. Good teaching should be good teaching across the country. It's an attempt for us to do that through one of our projects of national significance. That is, I think, an example of the kind of response to your question that we're trying to make from the Department.

ADMINISTRATOR CERTIFICATION MODELS AND STANDARDS

Mr. Regula. Does your effort, we're talking about teacher recruitment, preparation and development, does it go to the level of principals and superintendents?

Mr. Pasternack. That's a critically important question that you ask. As I said, one of the reasons we hear that good teachers are leaving is because of a lack of administrative support. Clearly, the kinds of training that we need to provide has to address all members of the learning community. We've got to look at para-educators, which are an incredibly rich source to address our shortage of personnel that we have. In many instances, they're people that know their communities, they're culturally competent, and they're committed to staying in those places. We need to help support them.

On the other end, we need to work with principals. We keep hearing that a lot of principals don't have specific knowledge and information about managing kids with disabilities and understanding issues in the IDEA. That applies to Superintendents, local school board members, and State board of education members as well. So we're really looking at the entire learning community when we're trying to address

professional development activities.

Ms. Neuman. I think you raise a very important point. Principals need to be our instructional leaders. They're the ones that monitor teachers, that make sure the teachers are pacing and teaching correctly. We have a \$10 million program focusing on improving instructional leadership with principals this year. We are in the process of developing an application to ensure that we get high-quality principals.

Mr. Regula. Well, it seems to me that that's an important element. Because they're the leaders. I talked with a young lady who was in Teach for America, who is in fact going to testify here. She said she is going to, in military parlance, re-up for another two year hitch. She's in a tough school in East Los Angeles. But she said the support she gets from the principal and teachers has been a key element in both helping her be a better teacher as well as giving her the kind of support she needs to do it well.

Well, you have a big challenge. Because the quality of the teachers is where it is. Ann?

TARGETED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mrs. Northup. Thank you.

I'm interested in the question, who do you listen to? I have seen a lot of the schools of education that are eager to have students longer, for more hours, teaching more years and so forth. And yet, I'm aware of a number of schools where intervention of one kind or another takes a certain form. For example, here in Washington, when they had the reading project in seven of the lowest scoring schools; in Louisville, when they took the school with the lowest scoring and put direct instruction in, teachers each got about six weeks training, as I understand it. It may have been less. And those scores dramatically changed.

That tells me it may not be how many years you're in school but what you're learning while you're there. And so, first of all, let me ask, Susan, if you want to comment on that.

Ms. Neuman. Well, I couldn't agree with you more. I think one of the things that you bring up is what Russ Whitehurst talked about before, which is targeted professional development, not professional development in creative movement, but professional development targeted to the kinds of skills we're interested in seeing.

The D.C. model is a wonderful example of what you just mentioned, Mr. Regula, and that is mentoring. Many of those teachers in D.C. improved because there was someone in the classroom, not only instructing them but showing them how to do it. They were very focused on improving reading. The instruction was about reading. And in a relatively short period of time, scores dramatically changed in terms of children's reading improvement.

We do not believe that this requires years and years of targeted instruction in educational pedagogy, which very often is synonymous with low-level, low-quality kinds of instruction.

Mrs. Northup. Well, exactly. I don't know whether my colleagues are having the same experience, but it seems to me that, primarily, we are being bombarded by schools of education

that say, ``Give us more money, give us students longer,' and they haven't done the job in the years that they have. It's like I said last week, we train engineers and rocket scientists in four years, and we can't train teacher in four years to teach? And yet in six weeks in a summer school, when it changes to a curriculum or an approach that's much more effective, the scores go up and the teachers learn it. I think the teachers don't get the benefit of the best education when they're there.

EDUCATION SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND REPUTATION

I got out of school 33 years ago. That was a long time ago. But at the very end of my education, I decided that I might want to be a teacher. And I took a lot of teaching courses the last semester. A lot of people did that, and I have to say, they were the easiest courses I ever took. I've noticed that some of the students that struggle in college are sort of directed into the departments of education. Because it's a place where they can get their degree more easily.

Do you think that, there is any study that shows where that's part of the problem? That universities trying to help students struggling in other subjects get out of school with a degree that maybe education is still the easiest courses that we have?

Mr. Whitehurst. I mentioned something related to that before you came in. We know, unfortunately, that students who major in education at the undergraduate level have significantly lower SAT scores than students who major in other fields. Related to your previous comment, we know that masters degrees have no predictive effect at all on student learning in the classroom. So the incentive system that many States and localities have in place that gives teachers raises for going back and earning masters degrees in education has no effect on student performance.

So we need to think about what we're doing in terms of attracting people into the teaching profession. We need some mechanisms that will attract brighter, more qualified people into the profession and retain them. We also clearly need to think about the nature of the training we're currently providing. It has generally not been as effective as it could be, and the research clearly supports this conclusion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Mrs. Northup. I guess that's another day's discussion. The qualities other than what you know academically are tremendously important. I have to say, I'm not sure for kindergarten, first grade, second grade, that you necessarily do need the highest SAT scores. A love of children, a knack for dealing with their unique needs and challenges, and being able to control a classroom atmosphere seem unmeasurable but important. I don't know how we go about that.

Mr. Whitehurst. I don't think that they are unmeasurable. I think they've not been measured. Most of our research has focused on high school teachers.

But I think that your insights and hypotheses, if you will, are very important things for us to investigate. Because we

need to know what the characteristics of effective teachers are.

PRAXIS AS A MEASURE OF TEACHER ABILITY

Mrs. Northup. And not just a story of a teacher here, a story of a teacher there.

Let me ask you about the PRAXIS test. We give teachers that test. There was an article in our local paper that teachers coming out of the University of Louisville scored lower than the rest of the State. Not surprisingly, there is an answer from Louisville that says, this isn't a good measure, and actually referred to an organization that has said this isn't a good measure.

Can you explain your views on this?

Mr. Whitehurst. I'm just trying to see who should best field this question. I'm not sure who among us knows about this.

Ms. Neuman. It's a very easy test. It's a very easy test of content knowledge. And it really doesn't discriminate between those people who know stuff and those people who don't know a lot of stuff.

One of the things I think we have not talked about before is that very often, people going into teacher training institutions have matriculated from community college institutions where they have received only remedial instruction thus far. They matriculate, having had a set of remedial courses at two- or four-year institutions, and then go only to a series of pedagogy courses. Therefore, they never develop a strong content knowledge base.

This is extraordinarily important. Because what that is suggesting is that the kinds of skills we are assuming our teachers need to know in order to teach well--the knowledge of literature, basic math, basic English--they are not receiving the high-quality instruction in four-year colleges that we assume they need to have.

So that's an area that we need to further examine.

PRAXIS AS A MEASURE OF TEACHER ABILITY

Mrs. Northup. The professor and chair at the department of teaching at my university says that by using standardized exams, students and schools are subjected to teacher exams that are racially and culturally biased and anti-working class. He talks about the PRAXIS, and says, ``Furthermore, the National Research Council recommended that States and Federal Government not use passing rates on these tests as the sole basis for judging the quality of teacher education programs.''

Can you again comment on that? Is the PRAXIS test the only measure that we should be using? Of course what he goes on to say is that it shouldn't be the only basis. But have you heard charges of it being culturally biased and racially biased? And can we fix that?

Mr. Whitehurst. Well, the PRAXIS test, like all standardized tests, places a premium on verbal abilities and the ability to learn the subject matter that is taught in school. I think the PRAXIS has two parts. There is a

specialized part and a general part. There is some weak evidence that the part of the PRAXIS that really gets at general verbal ability taps something in teachers that makes a difference in student performance. And that makes a certain amount of sense to me, that teachers who better understand and are better able to understand the English language and all of the things connected with vocabulary are probably better able to convey to students in a variety of classrooms information that they need.

But clearly, the PRAXIS test is not a very powerful instrument for selection, nor is it a powerful instrument for predicting which teachers would be the most effective teachers in the classroom. One of the things we've been encouraging colleges of education to do is to think about actually tracking their graduates into classrooms in the context of emerging State accountability systems, so that they could answer the question of whether the teachers they are training are in fact effectively teaching children in the classroom. We're to a point where we can do that, and we could start to measure the differential effectiveness of teachers colleges. We would not measure this using scores on the PRAXIS, but with the actual ability of graduates to do an effective job at teaching in the classroom.

I think once we have that sort of powerful feedback mechanism, we'll start to get some changes in the nature of the education of teachers.

Mrs. Northup. Thank you.

PROFESSION OF TEACHING

Mr. Regula. Mr. Wicker.

Mr. Wicker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm glad the Chairman asked earlier how many of you have actually been classroom teachers. And I understand that he's got a question pending that you're going to get back to him about how many people actually in the Department were classroom teachers.

Mr. Regula. If you'll yield.

Mr. Wicker. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. Regula. I'm going to give Mr. Whitehurst, since he's the numbers man, the task of reporting back to us how many people in the Department of Education have been in a classroom.

Mr. Wicker. This is a subject that I think we're all interested in. I'm particularly interested in it at this time in the life of my family, because my oldest daughter Margaret is graduating next month from the University of Virginia with a degree in English and Spanish. She wants to be a teacher. So I'm vitally interested in the profession of teaching, even more so than I was earlier.

MEASURING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

Let me start off by asking about measuring teacher effectiveness. I believe Mr. Whitehurst, in his written testimony, mentioned merit pay for teachers in a Cincinnati public school system. How do you measure the quality of a teacher? How did Cincinnati do it?

And also, how does that compare to the national board certification that I see a lot of my public school teachers involved in in the State of Mississippi? If you'll start by answering those questions, then I'll probably follow up.

Mr. Whitehurst. There are a number of ways to assess teacher quality. One way characterized by the national board is to have other professionals, other people who have been judged to be excellent teachers, take a look at what the teacher is doing, to look at a portfolio of activities, and make a judgment as to whether the teacher is performing at a high level.

Mr. Wicker. Are these teachers from the school or from outside?

Mr. Whitehurst. Generally from outside the school. I think in the context of a national board, depending on the area, the candidates actually can present a videotape of their teaching activities to be examined. So it's sort of an expert model, if you will, a judgment by other experts as to what represents high levels of teaching effectiveness.

Another way to do it is to look at the performance of students in classrooms, and to classify teachers as most effective who add the most value to children's education. And there is a very important question as yet unanswered as to whether those two ways of doing it line up. Whether teachers who are judged to be functioning at a high level by their peers are the same teachers who are generating the highest degree of learning in the classroom for students.

The Cincinnati system actually did it in another way. They looked at practices in the classroom. They would look at reading instruction, for example, and have observers in the classroom determining if the teachers were engaging in reading instruction in the way that the district wanted. So it was the change in practice in the classroom that drove their compensation system.

Mr. Wicker. How long has the Cincinnati system been in place?

Mr. Whitehurst. I cannot answer that. I'll certainly get back to you on it.

[The information follows:]

Cincinnati Teacher Compensation Proposal

The Cincinnati Public Schools implemented a substantially revised teacher evaluation system (TES) in December 2001. One component of this revised evaluation system proposes to link increases in teacher salaries to positive results on evaluations. This new component of the system was designed by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education team at the University of Wisconsin together with Cincinnati Public School (CPS) staff. CPS teachers and Board members are scheduled to vote in May 2002 on whether or not this proposal to link teacher compensation to evaluation results will be implemented.

Mr. Wicker. Are you able to say how it has been received by the faculty?

Mr. Whitehurst. I can't speak to that factually. I'm sure, just by reading newspaper accounts of it, there's a lot of controversy about any sort of differential compensation system.

And there is some research that indicates, I think, if not in the strongest fashion at least in the suggestive fashion, that compensation systems that focus on improvements at the school level rather than compensation systems that focus on the individual classroom teacher generate more buy-in from teachers. Such systems also seem to generate effective changes in instructional practice in the school. In other words, every teacher in the school gets a bonus if the school meets some target for improvement, rather than going down to the individual classroom teacher and saying, ``Mrs. Jones gets the bonus this year but Mrs. Smith does not! Such distinctions generate a lot of rancor at the individual school level that you don't get if you're rewarding the whole school.

Mr. Wicker. So it's a team effort in a sense.

Mr. Whitehurst. It's a team effort.

Mr. Wicker. I think you told Ms. Northup that there was very little correlation between the teacher going back and getting a masters or a doctors degree and student performance.

Mr. Whitehurst. Yes.

NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION AS A MEASURE OF TEACHER ABILITY

Mr. Wicker. I wonder if you're able to give me any information about a correlation between student performance and the teacher going through this national board certification process that I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Whitehurst. The national board has developed some data. In my judgment, it is not strong enough to draw conclusions with respect to the question that you are asking.

Mr. Wicker. And that's all the data you have?

Mr. Whitehurst. That's all the data we have at this point. My understanding is that they are in the process of doing more ambitious studies, but we don't have those results in yet.

SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION ADOPTING PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Wicker. I asked the Secretary about this the other day when he was here, so I'll just ask any of you, I've noticed that in my home State, some of the poorest public school districts are literally within the shadows of some of our universities that have education schools. I asked the Secretary if he was aware of a program that Jackson State University has to actually adopt three public schools that are very close by and that are marginal, at best, in their performance level.

I just wonder how many schools of education at our great universities see that as an outreach mission of a school of education. And if you can give me any information about any history that we have, or the advisability of such a program, where an education school says, we're going to show that at least in this neighborhood district, we can teach teachers to make a difference. Anyone like to try that? Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Neuman. I only have anecdotal information. I was a professor at Temple University for 10 years, in the heart of North Philadelphia. We adopted professional development schools which were very well known at the time as a model of improving both the teaching and the teacher.

Unfortunately, the professional development schools that

were selected in that area were not of the quality we would want. So many of our mentoring teachers, our pre-service teachers, would often see what is not rather than what is. Some of our schools----

Mr. Wicker. What is a professional development school?

Ms. Neuman. A professional development school was a model that was adopted a while ago based on a Holmes Group report that argued that universities should adopt a school, almost as a lab school of the type we had many years ago, where our teachers, all of our prospective teachers, go and see high-quality teaching. And the K-12 teachers actually would come and provide teaching in our schools of education.

So it was a reciprocal model where the teachers of the school came to the university and the university came to the school. Unfortunately, the quality of those schools was not what we would wish. So there were some times, and I can only tell you from my 10 years there, there were some times where our teachers would say, well, I guess we can learn by seeing the bad. But that was never a researchable question.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Wicker. Well, we talk about, and I had a question, I'm out of time, but we talk about getting teachers into underserved areas. It just seems to me that if we could demonstrate to education majors that you can go into a school, that the entire power and influence of an entire university school of education can go into a school district and actually make a difference, if we could demonstrate that to the student while they're still in college, then it might make it a bit easier for our top graduate in the education majors to go into schools that maybe didn't quite pay as much and weren't quite the tops in the scoring.

I wish that our entire education establishment would look at that.

Ms. Stroup. If I could just add to that. To get a partnership grant under Title II of the Higher Education Act, a school of education has to partner with a high-need local school district. The goal is to get the two of them to work together to come up with innovative reforms that benefit the local school district. This program is doing exactly what you're suggesting through that project. It's new. We don't have good evaluation data yet, because it was only authorized in the 1998 amendments. But it is operating along the lines you're talking about, of getting collaboration between the local schools and the schools of education, so that everybody is working together.

Mr. Wicker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Members of the panel, this afternoon, we'll have the dean of the University of Cincinnati where they do some of this, a young lady who's in the Teach for America program. Mr. Obey, you have invited a superintendent, am I correct?

Mr. Obey. Yes.

Mr. Regula. And also the Director of the National Commission on Teaching in America's Future.

Mr. Obey.

Mr. Obey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

Talk, talk, talk, talk. And talk, talk, talk, talk. I get frustrated when I sit in on meetings like this because, with all due respect to the people on both sides of the table, we've heard all kinds of wonderful things said about education this morning. All kinds of great ideas. And all kinds of concerns expressed about the need to do A, B, C, D and E.

But there ain't no money. The budget is essentially being frozen, after having gone up substantially over the last few years. And can you imagine, after the Congress has been so incredibly wasteful that we have blown so much money on education at the Federal level, that we're almost spending 3 cents out of every dollar that the Federal Government spends on education? Isn't that a terrible waste of money?

It always amazes me that the Federal Government takes the heat for the fact that schools don't perform when, in fact, we provide around 7 percent of the cost of education in Federal funds.

I'm sorry I wasn't here earlier, Mr. Chairman. I had to go to another hearing. But I understand while I was gone that our witnesses indicated their concern about the shortage of special education teachers, and yet the budget freezes special education training programs. We heard talk about the importance of principals and other school administrators. The budget eliminates the school leadership program.

We've heard talk, I'm told, about the problems of children with limited English proficiency. Some members of Congress are in that same position. [Laughter.]

Mr. Obey. But as I understand it, the budget is reducing funding for the program that helps to train ESL and bilingual teachers. The budget freezes the program that helps States upgrade their teacher certification programs. I've heard that there have been some good words about Teach for America from the Administration lately. But my understanding is that the application to the Department was cut. There will be more applicants for Teach for America. But not enough money to fund the applicants.

We have passed the mother of all mandates with the new Elementary and Secondary Education Bill, telling States, you've got to measure not at this point, but at this point, not in this grade, but that grade. And you've got to do it our way, baby. Several years ago I was told at a hearing we had in Wisconsin that in contrast to what's happening nationally, there are a higher percentage of students from the top half of graduating classes going into the school of education at four campuses in Wisconsin than you have going into other fields. I know that's an aberration.

It indicates, however, that I ought to be careful about supporting all kinds of narrow, rigid Federal mandates when in some areas my State seems to be doing a hell of a lot better than our neighbors whose conduct we're supposed to try now to emulate.

I don't mind the Congress trying to provide some standards and provide some guidance. But if we are really going to get into that big time, then it seems to me we ought to get into big time increases in funding for education. I don't see that

happening.

If you take a look at all of the programs that are funded, I mean, are frozen, and then you take a look at what's happening to State budgets, these conversations are very interesting but rather futile. Because we're not putting our money where our mouth is. And while dollars certainly don't determine all outcomes, you certainly can't achieve decent outcomes without dollars.

Patty Ashdown was the old leader of the liberal party in Britain who just got smart, retired and is now making some real money. He said in one of his departure speeches that the problem in too many democracies is that the passion of our words is not matched by the passion of our action. I certainly think that's the case where education is concerned. And it certainly is the case with the President's budget.

So Mr. Chairman, I don't really have any questions. I just sit here with some bemusement thinking how good we sound. I wish we sounded a little worse and looked a little better in terms of what we are asked to do this year. Because the budget that the Administration has presented doesn't measure up to the rhetoric. We can express all of the concerns that have been exposed today. We can express those concerns until the cows come home. But that's not going to produce any real change, unless we decide to really put some real resources into some of these programs. And it's obvious that if we're to do that, we're going to have to overcome the stiff opposition of the White House.

Nonetheless, thank you for your time.

MODELS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

Mr. Regula. Mr. Obey, if you would, to what did you attribute the success in Wisconsin in getting these higher quality people into the program?

Mr. Obey. More cheese--they eat more cheese. I don't know what it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. Obey. I suspect that what it is is that you've got a good work ethic and you have a tradition of public service. Maybe it's just luck and maybe it's teachers. I don't know what does it. And it doesn't happen every year, and it doesn't happen at all campuses.

But I know that it's happened on a number of campuses. That must mean that somewhere, somebody is doing something right, unless as is often the case, what happens in the human condition is happening by accident. I don't know.

Mr. Regula. Along those lines, do any of you have any experience with a similar phenomenon?

Mr. Obey. If I could just say, Mr. Chairman, my only point is that I think the Feds should be a little careful about requiring States that do better than the national average to meet somebody's idea of what is a perfect way to handle a problem.

Mr. Regula. In other words, it would put a strait jacket on what might be a very successful program.

Mr. Obey. Well, I think so. But, evidently, we're into mandates without money when it comes to education. I want to see what happens in Congress if we do that with respect to the

environment. I can imagine all kinds of hell breaking loose then.

Mr. Regula. Is anyone looking around the Nation to see these success stories and share the elements that go into those? Anyone in the Department? Is this a function of the Department? Anyone have an answer to that?

Ms. Neuman. We're beginning to. One of the things that we're trying very hard to do is spotlight schools, places where scientifically based reading instruction is happening and the children's achievement is improving. We're focusing on places where States are aligning their assessments with their content standards and the alignment is of high-quality and therefore, they are really assessing what they're instructing.

So our process of spotlighting places that are really doing well is just beginning.

Mr. Pasternack. If I may, Mr. Chairman, the President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education has been holding hearings around the country. At each of those hearings, we're trying to ask people to come forward and give us exemplars of model programs where they are achieving successful results for students with disabilities.

I would quickly point out to you an example from Elk Grove in California, the second fastest growing school district in the country, where Dave Gordon is the superintendent. Through a program of sustained, embedded, comprehensive professional development in the area of reading, they've gone from 16 percent of their kids in special education to 9 percent of their kids in special education. They attribute that to the fact that they're spending two-and-one-half hours a day teaching kids to read using a scientifically based model delivered by highly qualified instructors.

I think that we are clearly searching for models where things are working, so that we can then point them out to other school districts across this great country.

Mr. Whitehurst. And I would just add to that that our Consortium for Policy Research in Education specifically searches for examples where a State or local policy seems to be generating----

Mr. Regula. Do you have a mechanism for distributing these results to the schools of this Nation?

Mr. Whitehurst. Yes.

Mr. Regula. Ms. DeLauro.

Ms. DeLauro. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning.

NEED FOR HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS

I know the Chairman was a school principal. I had the honor, truly, of being a substitute teacher for a number of years in the New Haven public school system. When I first went to take the job, they said to me, what can you teach. I said, well, look, I had my graduate degree, I said, I can teach any of the social studies, history, whatever.

Long and short of it, I went into every classroom except for the shop in the course of my time being a substitute teacher, and I worked every single day. Because there was always a teacher that was out. And I have a very, very high

regard for the teaching profession. Several members of my extended family are teachers, principals, etc.

I want to kind of pick up a little bit, it was not my intention to do this, but I want to pick up where my colleague Mr. Obey left off. Teacher quality, there isn't anybody here who hasn't talked about the need for excellence in teaching, and the quality of the teachers that are going to be able to educate our youngsters. For religious purposes, my folks sent me to Catholic school. My kids went to public school, New Haven public school system, through high school.

But one would say about the private school system and in the religious experience that the nuns and the brothers or the priests would make sure that you were learning, that you would come out as a well educated youngster. But that's a small portion of our population that enjoys those benefits. And that most of our youngsters, 90 percent of our youngsters are in public schools. And as public servants, we have an obligation to make sure that the standards are raised.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

Again, I say to you, as I said to some of you before, tell me where I'm wrong. The Bush budget cuts funding for teacher quality by \$163 million. The budget freezes funding for the new quality State grant at \$2.8 billion, \$400 million below the authorization. The budget freezes funding to train early childhood educators at \$15 million. And we had the conversation the last time about the necessity of having excellence in early childhood teachers. Because as we know from the literature and the research, we know when children are learning.

The budget eliminates \$10 million in National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to train master teachers. The budget eliminates \$10 million for school leadership grants to train the next generation of principals with skills necessary to lead schools to success, only 27 percent of school districts report having a program to recruit or prepare aspiring principals. The budget eliminates the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology Program. Maybe on another part of the budget we're dealing with a lot of computers for schools, etc., but I'll tell you, we can box them all up, put them in a closet, close the door if you don't have the teachers who are going to be able to teach our kids to utilize those computers.

We've all been to schools, we go to schools, we see the labs. But if the teachers are not standing there that can train these kids, it's gone, it's useless, a waste of money. We can go back to giving them a pencil and a pad. That's all that they will need. And we do know today that my generation needed a textbook, these kids need computers in order to succeed. I'm never going to learn it, they're so far ahead of me. I lose this job, who knows what happens to me, you know. Nevertheless, we are going to eliminate the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology Program.

We cut, budget cuts funding my 50 percent to help improve teachers improve the teaching of American history. Budget freezes, funding to train special ed, bilingual, math and science, even though we know about the shortage. The budget limits funding to improve teaching in the areas of foreign

languages and writing. The budget freezes funding for the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program, \$90 million.

We do say we're going to propose a tax deduction for out of pocket teacher's expenses for classroom supplies, etc. But you can't realize that for two years, until I guess April of 2005. Most teachers, the tax benefit is going to be about \$100.

The budget does propose an increase in the amount of loan forgiveness from \$5,000 to \$17,000 for special ed, math, science. A good piece. And I might just say, it's here, that we do have modest increase for Troops to Teachers, Transition to Teaching, good. We also have \$50 million in this budget that doesn't specify whatever it is that's going to be done with the money. I have a lot of questions, all of which I can't ask. I will submit them.

INSUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

Ms. DeLauro. But I think the point is clear. My colleague Mr. Obey made it. I didn't hear all that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said. It is impossible to move at teacher quality if you starve the programs of the resources to be able to do it. Let me quote you people in my State of Connecticut here.

The issue is not going to be the States' educational leadership capacity to deal with the new policy and program requirements, but rather--this is No Child Left Behind--but rather the fiscal implications of the new law in terms of being the newest and the largest unfunded mandate imposed on States and their local districts since IDEA.

If it's Wisconsin, if it's Connecticut, help us. Where are we going with this? What's the plan? Who are we going to teach? How are we going to get the excellence that we are looking for? Or are we setting up a set of criteria by which we continue to fail? And that maybe says that public education is doomed to failure. So let's try to go with those things that some people believe are the direction to do, but you build in the bias against public education. Ninety percent of our kids are in public education.

But 3 cents on the dollar, 7 percent of the Federal budget, it's wrong. It's wrong, because we all believe in our hearts that education is the way to succeed. And if we believe that, we certainly cannot have a budget on teacher quality which takes the heart and soul and the resources to make it a reality.

Maybe what we should just do is you should just come up and say, we can't achieve it, we can't get there. But the conversation is nice. But the reality is a disaster in the making. And you know, it's hard to continue to have the conversations without feeling a sense of, why do we bother. I know why I bother, because come hell or high water, we're going to move in a direction where we can do something for public education in the United States. When you go to those classrooms and you see those kids in elementary school or in preschool or you go into the middle school and their eyes are as big as half dollars, these kids want to learn. And those teachers want to teach.

And we have an obligation to give them the resources and

not take this budget and talk about it in glowing terms when at every turn, we cut off the resources to make sure that those kids have the knowledge and the understanding and the tools that they need to succeed. And whether you sit on that side of the table or we sit up here, if we can't do that, we ought to let a whole new crew of folks do it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. I'm maybe not quite as pessimistic as you might be, Ms. DeLauro, but I will say, I was down to the Air and Space the other night to see that film, IMAX, on the space shuttle. I went home and said to my wife, you can hardly imagine that human beings had the skill to put together what is the space shuttle and all the scientific elements and mechanical elements that go into that.

I guess in some ways, the fact that we could do that has to be a tribute to some phase of our education system that produced the people that could develop a space shuttle and all the ingenious, even in the area of communications, computers. I marvel, in a matter of six weeks, your computer is out of date because of the ingenuity of people like Bill Gates.

Those are bright spots.

Ms. DeLauro. I think it's, you know, remarkable what people can accomplish and what they can do. Imagine if we had a few more resources to allow the majority of our population to be able to succeed in what they do. We've got a whole lot of teachers who do a whole lot of spending of their own personal funds to make sure, and you know that, you were in a school, I was in a school.

Mr. Regula. I spent some.

Ms. DeLauro. Whatever it takes, if you have to bring it to school, to make sure they have what they need. Because you know, education is the great equalizer in this country. If we're going to do it in a public way with 90 percent of our kids, then we ought to put our resources where our mouths are, and we want to not shortchange kids.

Mr. Regula. What you say is true. That was quite ingenious of the founding fathers and those who said that we're going to have free public education for every person. That really was a great step in our Nation's history. And that's exactly what you have said.

Ms. DeLauro. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

FUNDING FOR TEACHER QUALITY

Mr. Regula. I want to go back to you, Mr. Obey, if you like. But I have one question. What do we spend totally in this bill in teacher quality or improvement? Do you have any number at all?

Ms. Stroup. The fiscal year 2003 request, includes \$3.2 billion for teacher quality line-items.

Mr. Regula. That is an increase, or decrease? Or is it flat funding.

Mr. Skelly. Mr. Chairman, that is a slight decrease in the amount for the same line items in 2002.

Mr. Regula. So if you track the line items that focus only on teacher quality improvement, it would be a little less in 2003 than 2002?

Mr. Skelly. When we look at just those line items for teacher quality, it's slightly less in 2003 than 2002. There are a few other items that we sometimes don't count in the category of teacher quality that make it about even. For example, there's a new requirement in the Title I program that at least 5 percent, and up to 10 percent of the Title I money gets used for teacher quality improvement. That adds funds to teacher quality, since the budget was increased in this area.

Mr. Regula. Is that at the discretion of the Department or the discretion of each school that gets the Title I money?

Mr. Skelly. School districts and LEA's have to spend at least 5 percent. That's a new requirement. But they could spend up to 10 percent.

Mr. Regula. For teacher improvement within their system?

Mr. Skelly. Right. Ms. DeLauro also referred to the loan forgiveness proposal, which would add about \$45 million in cost. The teacher supply tax deduction, which actually was passed by the Congress already and signed by the President into law, would add about \$16 million. Teachers could get a deduction of up to \$250 for supplies that they donated.

Mr. Regula. So that's on top of the other.

Mr. Skelly. And another item that's not in this bill but is in the budget is the National Science Foundation, which received an increase of \$40 million for a math and science partnership effort. When you add all of these items together, teacher quality receives about the same level of funding from 2002 to 2003.

[Clerk's note. The total amount available for teacher quality improvements under the 2003 request is \$4.3 billion when teacher-related line items, set-asides under Title I and Reading First and transfer provisions are included.]

Ms. DeLauro. Mr. Chairman, would you yield for a second?

Mr. Regula. Sure.

Ms. DeLauro. But if you've got tax deductions, that's not a resource to the school. I get a tax deduction. That's not money that's going into the training. You take money away from Title I, that's reading and math instruction, what that's all about. You can't rob Peter to pay Paul here, or just move things around that way. Tax deductions are neat, they're wonderful, I'm for them. But that's not money that's going back into the school system. I'm going to go put it in a 401(k).

Mr. Pasternack. Mr. Chairman, it's hard to answer your question simply. For example, in the area of special education, the Administration is requesting another \$1 billion to help address the issues that we face in trying to improve results for students with disabilities across the country. Through our capacity building grants, one of the ways that we allow States to spend their part B dollars, some of those funds clearly go into professional development and enhancing teacher quality.

We're also asking for \$51.7 million, as you know, for next year for State Improvement grants. Seventy-five percent of the money through the State Improvements grants goes into professional development.

So there are sources of revenue within the budget that go to address the issue of enhancing teacher quality. Because we know that no matter what we do in law, no matter what we do in regulation, no matter what we provide in funding, if we don't

have highly qualified teachers working with all kids, including kids with disabilities, we're not going to achieve the excellence that parents demand.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Obey.

MEETING THE NEW TEACHER QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Obey. One quick question. How many teachers do not meet the qualifications established in H.R. 1? What is our best estimate of what it will cost to provide the professional development that's needed to assure that they all do meet those standards by the designated date?

Ms. Neuman. I'm sorry, Mr. Obey, I don't have information about how many teachers are unqualified.

Mr. Whitehurst. I would simply add that this coming year States have to report, for the first time, the percentages of their teachers that meet the qualification standards in H.R. 1. So at that point, we will be able to report specific results to you. But we don't yet have a data collection effort in place that would address your question.

We have statistics on the percentages of teachers that are certified at each grade level, in each State, in each district. That we can provide to you. But that's not the same thing as the precise requirements in the new law.

Mr. Obey. I assume that if the Administration supported the requirements of H.R. 1--they did so quite enthusiastically--that they did that because they felt there was a problem which was definable in nature. How did you arrive at a specific set of qualifications if you didn't have any idea what percentage of teachers today did not meet those requirements?

Mr. Whitehurst. I can certainly get back to you with data on the percentages of teachers who do not meet certain of the requirements. I can tell you, for example, the percentage of teachers who are not certified in the subject matter that they teach in high school, and that's one of the requirements of being qualified. But I can't give you the whole answer.

Mr. Obey. What I'm trying to get at is, what is our expectation about the costs that will be incurred in order to correct the problem?

Mr. Whitehurst. I don't know.

Mr. Obey. I'm sure that the costs will be considerable if the problem is sufficient to warrant the Administration's pushing for the establishment of these standards in the first place. So assuming that it's significant, I'm looking for evidence that we are trying to help State and local officials meet those costs. And I don't see any evidence in this budget that we're following the logic of H.R. 1.

Ms. DeLauro. Will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. Obey. Sure.

Ms. DeLauro. I would add to that, teachers, what are the numbers of para-professionals that don't meet the qualifications? Do vocational education teachers have to meet the standards as well? And the cost question is clear, but for all of those, how much will it cost in additional education and training to look at elementary, secondary and the para-professionals, to deal with that in the requirement? Is there a specific amount that you can point to within the budget that is

there in order to help the States and localities to meet these new standards?

Ms. Neuman. As you know, many of these issues are State decisions. As we've talked about before, different States have different criteria for licensure. So therefore, some estimates that I've seen, but it's very variable according to the report you read, focus on the fact that many of our teachers are not teaching in subject areas that they've been trained in. We know this is a problem. We also know that many of our para-professionals are actually teaching instead of helping our students practice some of those skills.

One of the things that we haven't talked about yet is, not only are there funds in other programs, such as Reading First State Grants, which is designed for professional development specifically in reading, and Math and Science Partnerships, designed to focus on professional development in math and science, but there are opportunities here for the transferability of funds throughout. Therefore, if a State is in the situation where there are a number of teachers who are unqualified or para-professionals who need further qualifications, this budget allows us flexibility and transferability so that those States can use those funds for that purpose.

Ms. DeLauro. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Obey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MEETING THE NEW TEACHER QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Regula. We're going to run out of time, but pursuant to Mr. Obey and Ms. DeLauro, I was just looking in the language for H.R. 1, every child deserves a high quality teacher, that's what we're talking about. But all new teachers will have to be licensed or certified, that's in three years from now, I believe, by the State, hold at least a bachelor's degree, pass rigorous State tests on subject knowledge and teaching skills, which is kind of a new thing.

Existing teachers will also have to meet similar criteria. Reaching this goal will require reform of traditional teacher training, that's a true statement, which is usually conducted in colleges of education, as well as through the innovative expansion of alternative routes to teacher licensure. That's a big order. Are you all working on getting ready to tell us how to do these things?

This came out of the First Lady's A Quality Teacher In Every Classroom. That is a big order.

ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION ROUTES

Ms. Neuman. And one of the things that we know is we cannot continue to do things the way we always have done them. It's not business as usual. We need to focus on alternative certification routes. And we have evidence that some of them are working. We need even more evidence and more examples. We've talked about Elk Grove, where we have teachers who are being trained by the school district that demands certain skills for their teachers. They have found evidence that, when those teachers are highly trained and they're given credits by

the local higher ed institution, those teachers are more skilled.

So I think we need to see more examples like those around the country.

Mr. Regula. It seems to me that part of all this success would be, if people say, I am a teacher, with pride. Say it with pride.

Ms. Neuman. Yes.

Mr. Regula. Does the Department interact with colleges of education?

Mr. Whitehurst. Yes.

Ms. Neuman. Yes, we do.

Mr. Regula. Because it seems this is all a partnership, a team effort. It's going to be State departments of education, it's going to be colleges of education, it's going to be the United States State Department. They have to interact if we're going to accomplish these goals. I have to say again, it's a big order.

Mrs. Northup. It is a big order.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, would you yield?

Mr. Regula. Certainly.

Mr. Obey. They can interact but they ain't going to do it without any money because this budget freezes programs to improve teacher colleges.

Ms. DeLauro. Would you yield for one second? I'm looking at a sheet of paper here that says, for the year 2001-2002, all new para-professionals, this is, all new para-professionals hired with Title I funds must meet new standards of quality, 2002-2003, all new public school teachers hired must be highly qualified. We talk about bachelors, State certified, 2005-2006, all, 100 percent of core academic subjects must be highly qualified.

I go back to--we always learned that if you can design what you want to try to do and try to do it in a way to achieve success. I always think the goal is to achieve success. I just think that this is the recipe for failure. Because as far as I know, we are in the middle of 2002. We don't even know how many para-professionals need to be trained, or what it's going to cost to do that. So already we're behind the curve on that.

Again, it's belaboring the same thing. But if this is designed to portray that public education is not a direction that we want to continue in, now, that's a perspective or point of view. I can hardly believe it. But you can't continue to lay out a whole set of goals and achievements and successes and then not to provide the wherewithal to the States and to the localities to be able to do it.

Again, it's a recipe for maybe proving that somebody believes that public education, that we're back to maybe the Department of Education ought to be eliminated. That was a goal a few years ago, which the American public didn't think was a good goal. Anyway.

Concluding Remarks

Mr. Regula. Well, as you gathered from this morning's hearing, there are some challenges out there, I think for all of us. If we're going to achieve the goal of no child, that in

itself is an enormous goal, no child left behind, it's going to take a partnership of the Congress, those of you that, you're all professionals at the Department, it's going to take the States' involvement, and it's going to take frankly parents' involvement, too.

What a wonderful thing we can do for the future of America if we work at achieving this goal. Thank you all for being here.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Wednesday, April 24, 2002.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

WITNESSES

LAWRENCE J. JOHNSON, DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, OHIO

AUBRILYN REEDER, TEACHER, EAST LOS ANGELES SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

THOMAS G. CARROLL, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TEACHING AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

LEW FINCH, SUPERINTENDENT, CEDAR RAPIDS COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

Mr. Regula. Let us get started. We have a very interesting panel, particularly following up on this morning's testimony.

Our first witness today is Dr. Lawrence Johnson, Dean of the College of Education, University of Cincinnati. We have heard interesting things about what you are doing down there, so I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you very much for the opportunity to present to your committee, and thank you for undertaking this task of trying to understand teacher education better and the challenges that are facing teacher education.

Let me tell you just a brief bit about myself. I taught special education on the south side of Chicago. It was with children that had acting out behaviors. I have spent 20 years in various roles in Head Start. Currently, I am still the co-director of our on-campus Head Start program.

Our university is a public university of about 33,000 students. One of those programs that we provide in that university is the College of Education. There are 2,500 students in my college of education, and we graduate about 250 to 300 students every year.

Teacher education is our biggest program in the college, but my college provides training for individuals to be counsellors, administrators, health professionals, school psychologists and a variety of other kinds of related services.

At the University of Cincinnati, in the late 1980s, we undertook to reform our teacher education program. It was in response to the whole plethora of articles and things that were coming out, talking about the mediocrity of schools, and how we had to do something, and that we were at Nation at risk if we

did not change our schools.

What we set out to do at the University of Cincinnati was to try to reform our teacher education under three principles. One was extensive content area preparation. One was intensive preparation, and how to make that content accessible to the children that our teacher candidates would teach, and to provide our teacher candidates with heavily mentored experiences, as they practice what they were learning in the schools. We entitled this reform the Cincinnati Initiative for Teacher Education.

To ensure deep content for all of our students, our students received a Baccalaureate Degree in education and a Baccalaureate Degree in one of the colleges in arts and sciences, specific to whatever it was they were going to teach. Our students participated in year-long internships, and used research-based practices to teach their content.

As I said, we are proud of our teacher education program, and have received recognition from the National Commission on Teaching in America's Future, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, American Federation of Teachers, Ohio Business Round Table.

We were featured in Time Magazine, and featured on the NBC Nightly News. The U.S. News and World Report did a report on us, and we were in a PBS documentary entitled, ``Only a Teacher.''

It is important, particularly from some of the questions that I heard this morning for me to tell you that our program has continued to grow and we have continued to look at ourselves.

Like our students, we have tried to embrace a continuous improvement process, in which we have looked at the needs of our school, the needs of our student candidates, and worked with our school partners to try and develop the program.

Along the way, we decided that the burdens of two Baccalaureate Degrees for students to take was too much time for the students to do, and it took the students too long to get out of our teacher ed. program. As was suggested here this morning, our program continued to grow in years and years.

So now we still have the extensive content, but we have taken away some of the other general education and other requirements that it would require for someone to have two degrees.

We have also embraced a whole series of alternative pathways, working with our school system, with our superintendent of schools, and some of the local schools, to take mid-career changers in the field, and to provide them with the expertise to be able to be teachers.

However, in all of these pathways, we have made sure that the students must follow the same accountability measures. In our case, we use Practices 1, we use Practices 2, we use Practices 3, as all measures to demonstrate teacher accountability.

One of the biggest things that we have learned is that it is not our job to provide the perfect teacher. I think we were trying to bring in everything we possibly could into a four or five year program.

Now what we recognize is that teachers grow over time.

Teacher education is developmental, and that what we must have is an ongoing partnership with the schools. We must be able to provide them a competent, qualified teacher, who has the ability to grow.

In fact, the research would suggest that it is after your fifth year of teaching that you really begin to mature, and it is around year seven and eight that you become the most outstanding teacher.

So given all of those things, our teacher education program has grown. Now we believe that these components are what make up a solid teacher education program.

I have provided you citations in the testimony, but let me give you those points. First, there must be rigorous content. Students must have the right kind of mathematics and science training. Early childhood teachers need a rich and solid experience, just as well as all teachers. But they must have good content to build on.

Second, they must be able to use that content and teach people how to access that. It is not enough to understand differential equations. You need to be able to assess, if a child has gotten your example, whether you need a new example.

You need to be able to know how to, on the spur of the moment, make decisions about where to go and what to do. So there must be a combination of how you teach and the content that you have.

You must have rigorous and extensive clinical experiences with children. These things are best learned by doing. So there must be frequent and often kinds of mentored experiences in the skills, where students have a chance to take what they are learning in the content courses, what they are learning in pedagogy and seeing how that does in practice.

In fact, students need a chance to try things out, not do very well on them, try them again, and succeed. That had a far better impact on students.

Students need to have experiences in diverse populations. This country, the diversity, is growing at incredible rates. This is an incredible strength that we can build on, but the same thing does not work with all children.

We must be able to differentiate in instruction. We must be able to address the needs of our special needs students, and those students that challenge the system. There is no group of students that we can afford to leave behind. We must build into the teacher training program these diverse kinds of experiences.

They must have technological expertise. Technology is changing the way that students learn in an incredible rate. Everything we do is focused on technology.

If I could just give you a brief story of my children. My son and a couple of his buddies, not too long ago, were in the other room talking. Like a good father, they did not know I could hear them. So I thought I would be nice and quiet and listen to them, and see if I could get any dirt. [Laughter.]

Mr. Johnson. In the process, what they said is that they now can do their homework at our local library. I thought, why can they now do their homework? So the curiosity, even though I might have gotten some dirt, got the better of me. So I came around the corner and I said, why can you all now do your

homework at the library?

What they told me is that library now had let students have access to the Internet. I said, what has that got to do with anything? They said, that is how we get our information. That is how I look things up.

I said to them, what are books for? They laughed. They said, your dad is so strange. They said, what books are for is, you read for pleasure, for books. That is what they explained to me; that if you want some information, they do not have time to go to the books.

That is an example of how this new group of children are viewing things, what they are seeing, and teachers need to be able to manage that. We are now even talking about providing virtual high schools, providing education courses, degrees on line. So we need to make that a critical piece.

We must have ongoing support for professional development. We must recognize that teaching is a developmental practice. Like other professions, you practice. You get better and you get better, and there must be structure. It is not one-shot deals, but we must have partnerships with the schools to continue.

Finally, and perhaps this may be one thing that we have not done as well on education, that I think we are doing, and it must be much better now, we must have a multi-tiered accountability system, so that we can demonstrate that our teachers are learning the content that we are giving them, are able to demonstrate that into the field, and that we can ensure for the public to do.

I have lots of things in my testimony here about the challenges of school. I will not go into that. You can read that.

Let me just say that teachers have a much harder job than they did. They are facing more diversity in the schools. They are facing violence. They are facing all of the kinds of things that we are seeing.

I would like to leave you with a couple of thoughts in doing this. Part of this is from my blue collar background. I am first generation college; but darn it, to a teacher, education is just hard work. It is just like everything else we do; just like being a Representative, being a Dean, being anything else. If you are going to do it right, it is really hard.

There are not sexy or quick or other kinds of fixes that are going to turn teacher education around. We are either going to figure out, what is it that students needs to know, how is it that we are going to hold people accountable as to what they need to know, and get down to the business of doing teacher education right. Any quick fix is destined to become another experiment that our children bear the brunt of.

Teacher education is expensive. I am not asking you to throw money at teacher education, in trying to do that. But I am saying, do not try to make us do this on the cheap. There are many colleges and many universities, and mine is not one of them, in which they see their college of education as a cash cow, in which that college of education brings in an exorbitant amount of revenue, compared to how much it costs, and it funds all of the other things that are valued in the institution: physics, engineering, whatever it might be. We must

provide the right set of resources to be able to do teacher education right.

Teacher education is the responsibility of the whole institution. It is not my fault when students do not do well on the practice scores. It is equally the fault of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and all of the faculty that tried to do this in the Provost and everybody else. It is all of our responsibility.

We must create a seamless educational system, P-K through 16. I am almost to the end here, so if I could just give you one other little story that I think has had a dramatic impact on me.

About a year ago, I was asked to be principal for a day of a school in the west end. It is a school right off of the Ohio River. It is in the flats. It is a low income area. It serves primarily African Americans and white children of Appalachian descent.

The principal knows that I am first generation college. My grandfather was a janitor, the whole deal. He wanted me to talk about, you know, how I made it and the struggles. Boy, I was just of myself; presenting, going to the things, and doing whatever.

I was presenting to a fourth grade class, and a little girl raised her hand. She said to me, is there anybody that looks like me in your college? The whole class, it was like, eyes darted on me. The whole class knew exactly what she was talking about.

No one really believed that college was an option for this group of children. To be honest with you, nobody had ever graduated from high school even out of this little strip of land down there, let alone go on to college. She was not an African America child. She was white child, but it would have been as prophetic or even more prophetic.

If children feel that already at the fourth grade that the options and hopes of this country are already limited to them, think about when it is when they are enticed with drugs or early sexual behavior, or any of the other seductive traps that lay for all of us out there, and they do not believe they have that.

My wife recently, talking to my daughter, who is now a freshman in high school, said to my daughter, you know, all the things that mothers and daughters talk about, about boys and things like that.

My daughter said to my wife, I am going to be a lawyer. I am not going to get engaged and those kinds of things, so that I cannot be a lawyer. The difference between the two young girls was one seeing hope and the other seeing that, is there really somebody in your college like me.

The last thing I wanted to talk about is the notion of alternative pathways. I heard this morning from the group pushing alternative pathways as the panacea and what can fix higher education and teacher education.

I am here to tell you that now all deans in this country, not all college of education, are against these alternative pathways. In fact, I have several of them in my college that we are running.

I am here to tell you though that we are absolutely

committed to the notion that every child has the right for a caring, competent, and qualified teacher. Then if we are going to embrace these alternative pathways, let us make sure that the accountability systems that ensure good teaching are applied to these systems, as well, and not make them be a back door.

Because what is going to happen, it is our most distressed school districts, our most urban school districts, our most rural districts that will utilize these teachers. Those children cannot afford more to set them back and more challenges that they need to have happen.

I thank you very much for this opportunity. I greatly appreciate and am so pleased that you all are trying to understand teacher education. Thank you.

Mr. Regula. Thank you. I think Mr. Obey and I will reserve questions until we have had the whole panel speak. This is all very interesting to us. After you were here this morning, you realize what is involved.

Our next witness is Aubrilyn Reeder, who is a teacher in East Los Angeles School District, and was a person who went through Teach for America.

I think you should tell us a little bit about your experience, as you have told me on the phone, about how you got into this, and what your experiences were, and what you would suggest that we can do on this subcommittee to improve that program. Then we will have the same question for all of you.

We are here to see how we can make education better in America, and we are sitting on \$50 billion, Mr. Obey and I, to figure out how to do it. Mr. Obey thinks it ought to be more than that. [Laughter.]

So Aubrilyn, we look forward to your testimony.

Ms. Reeder. First, I wanted to thank both Mr. Obey and Mr. Chairman for being interested in new teacher experiences. It was just very nice to hear that you were interested in those types of experiences.

For the past three years, I have been a sixth grade math, science, and reading teacher in Los Angeles Unified School District. I have been a Teach for America core member. I have been a Teach for American learning team leader. I have been more recently the math department representative for the Literacy Committee at my school.

Every once in awhile, I get a change to be Aubrilyn Reeder, a native of Northern Virginia, and a product of its public school system.

As I was growing up, I always wanted to be a teacher. But I was a very successful and ambitious child. For whatever reason, a lot of teachers and family members discouraged me from that profession because, as I was told, those were not necessarily qualities that were necessary for being a teacher. That feeling lingered with me, because I did have that ambitious, competitive edge to me.

When I start to hear about the program, Teach for America, it exposed teaching for what it is. It is an ambitious program of people that go into schools and try and make those students just as successful as they were, when they were students.

So that ``I want to be a teacher'' part of me was finally able to convince the ``I got all my math right in the fourth

grade part of me'' that successful and ambitious were qualities that were important for all teachers to have.

There were three main programs that, I think, smoothly might be a little bit too positive, but it helped make my first three years run relatively smoothly, although there have been bumps along the way. That was the Teach for American Program.

Mr. Regula. If you will excuse me, we have a vote on. Rather than interrupt you much further down in your testimony, I think Mr.Obey and I will go and vote, and then we will come back and let you finish.

Ms. Reeder. Okay.

Mr. Regula. But I might tell all of you, I learned about Aubrilyn's experience through her parents and I called her. We had quite a conversation. I was so intrigued with what you are doing.

I am very interested in getting young people like yourself in the teaching profession. That is the future. I have respect for what the President has done. But more important even than the counting and testing and so on is having a good teacher in every classroom.

That is why I thought your testimony would be very important. We do fund the program Teach for America. In part, because of our conversation last year, they got more money in the present bill, and they are going to get more in the next one.

Ms. Reeder. Good.

Mr. Regula. We will be right back.

[Recess.]

Mr. Regula. Okay, we have got some more votes coming, but we decided we would come back and keep working until the next one. So Aubrilyn, we will go on with your testimony.

Ms. Reeder. All right, I think that what I was about to say was that there were three main programs that helped make things run more smoothly for me. The programs were the Teach for America program, the Mentor program that was actually offered through Los Angeles Unified School District, and the UCLA Department of Education's Cinderax programs for teachers.

With the first program, Teach for America, prior to teaching in the fall in my school placement in Los Angeles, I had an opportunity to work for five weeks in a training institute for Teach for America.

What this consisted of was, we worked in a group of teachers, and we actually taught summer school classes to students in the Houston Unified School District.

Mr. Regula. Now you had your teaching degree?

Ms. Reeder. No, I had actually just graduated from college with my Bachelor of Arts.

Mr. Regula. Okay.

Ms. Reeder. I majored in cognitive science.

So no, I did not have a teaching degree. I kind of was jumping into something brand new. So when we went down there, it was a crash course, and it was a good crash course. We spent our mornings working with each other in a summer school classroom. So there were four of us that were responsible for a group of children.

In the afternoons, we received professional development from the Teach for America staff, which laid the foundation for

us of what it meant to be a teacher in a classroom.

The best part about that institute for me was that, you know, having grown up always wanting to be a teacher, I had lots of wild ideas about what it meant to be a teacher. I mean, I wanted every corner of my room to be covered in something bright. I wanted all kinds of colors, crayons, glue, everything wildly creative, totally different, something new every day. The reality is, that can be counter-productive to actually the kids learning.

So it helped me kind of quickly weed out, not only is this not realistic, this is not actually teaching all the time. It helped me realize that the bottom line is, what did my students learn that day. It set me up for, this is a long process for me. I am not going to learn it in five weeks. I am going to learn it throughout my career.

I was very lucky, when I left the program, I came to Los Angeles, and I was placed in Nimitz Middle School, which is in Huntington Park in the East L.A. area. It is the second largest middle school in the country. It has 3,600 students, and that is for sixth, seventh, and eighth grade.

Just to give you an idea of how many kids are in this community, down the street is the largest middle school in the country. So this is an area with many, many, many families.

At my school, it is 99 percent Latino. I have worked with ESL students, but I have also worked with English only students, who grew up speaking English in the home. This year, I actually have a mixture. So every year has been a little bit different for me.

The beauty of my school is that its philosophy is that we want to keep new teachers. So from the very beginning, I had support.

My first week of school, I actually had somebody that was like a shadow teacher. This teacher actually just did everything that I needed to be done. She got my supplies. She anticipated my questions. She got my copies. She put up my bulletin board. She helped me with role book, which is an incredibly complicated system in the district.

So all of those little things that kind of trip new teachers up that first week were done by somebody else for me, and I was able to focus on my lessons. The consequence of that was that my students saw somebody that was very competent running their classroom, rather than somebody bumbling around, trying to figure out a system. So that was one of the great things about being placed at Nimitz Middle School.

The other great thing was the mentor program, which is offered through the district. Once again, I think that the beauty of the program at my school was the teachers who ran it. I think they took a program, and I think they ran with it.

My personal mentor, who was, is and will always be my mentor, Terri Pearson. She is the most amazing math teacher you could imagine. She never sees an obstacle. Her goal is, my students will be the best.

I have never gone to her where she did not have an answer. There were so many times that first year when I said, you know what, they cannot do proportions. I am moving on. That is it. I cannot do it anymore. She said, well, try this or try this, and she always had an idea for me.

I knew it was because she read every magazine. She went to every conference. She was constantly learning, herself. The same energy she put into teaching her students and teaching herself, she put into helping me become a better teacher.

She actually sat down with me for several days, and we just went through whole units; not like, you know, just real dry units, but really good, rich units, that were especially helpful to me with a group of students that were really struggling with the English language. So the benefit of that was, that first year, I just had a lot of support.

Just talking about the other people in my school, any time there was a problem or an issue, immediately somebody was down there to help me out. I mean, if I went and I said, I do not know what to do. This student does not seem to respond to what I am asking them to do, you know, they always had suggestions for me, and always helped me worked out the problems.

This is not necessarily typical of experiences. It does happen. But I just felt that at my school, that was one of the great parts of it, that it was always there for me and very supportive.

The last program that I feel like has kind of guided my wanting to be a teacher past the second year commitment in Teach for America was through the programs through UCLA. UCLA's Department of Education's Center-Ags offers programs for teachers of various experience.

So this is actually the first program I was in that was offered to more than just first year teachers. In my classes, there were first year teachers, ten year teachers, teachers of fifteen years. The one common bond between all of us is that we wanted to get better.

So that idea that you work with teachers to build, to make gains in student achievement was something that inspired me to stay longer; that made me realize, you know what, it is not just about what is happening in my classroom. It is about what is happening in all of our classrooms.

What can we all be doing to help our students get to the levels where they need to be? How can we help them live up to our expectations, and then exceed them, so we have to raise them even more?

So those three programs were the things that kind of have been almost my backbone since I have been out in Los Angeles. It has been a positive experience for me.

There have been time, though, where I am like, you know what, this is too much. I cannot look in another parent's eyes whose child is not achieving what they need to be achieving and say, you know, or help give them answers.

Two weeks ago, I spoke with a parent, and I remember the saying to me, we have really been working hard with him. You know, we are really hoping he makes some gains on the Stanford 9 test. I remember thinking, you know, please, please say we have worked hard enough this year for that. It was like I just felt this surge of the greater responsibility that I have in that classroom.

So there are a lot of responsibilities and there are discouragements that come along the way. But for each discouragement, for each time where I thought, how is it that we are not getting this yet; there has been, you know,

Lisette, who is doing who science fair project on how we learn best, reading or when we listen to things.

Then there has been Javier, who after working after school for two weeks, knows long division, when he had never divided before in his life.

So for each discouragement, there has been something that has kind of said, all right, you know, I can do this two more years. I can do this three more years. I can do this for the rest of my career.

Mr. Regula. So you are going to stay with it for at least the time being.

Ms. Reeder. For the time being, I am in. I am committed.

Mr. Regula. That is terrific.

I think Mr. Obey, what we might do is, do the questions for the first two, because we are going to get called back here. Yes, let us do that.

Dr. Johnson, are you now on a four year or a five year program?

Mr. Johnson. It depends on which of our licensure programs you would be talking about. Our Early Childhood Program has just shifted to a four year program, and we are able to get the work done in a four year period.

Our secondary program, just by the requirements of the State, it is almost impossible to complete it in four years, because you need almost a second degree.

Mr. Regula. But you end up with two degrees?

Mr. Johnson. In our secondary program, students can choose to get two degrees, and that is an option for them to do.

Mr. Regula. Yes.

Mr. Johnson. But it will still be more than four years, if they do not choose to get the second degree. It will probably be close to five years.

For our middle school program, that is the way Ohio is structured, early childhood to grade three, middle school, four, five, six, seven, and eight. I am not sure where that one ends, and then secondary.

In the middle school, they have to demonstrate competence in two areas, like mathematics and science. So in secondary, it is pretty easy for them to get a second degree if they want to. In middle school, it is also pretty easy for them to get a second degree, if they want to. In early childhood, they probably will not, and it would be harder for them to get a second degree.

Mr. Regula. Do you run into resistance from students having to go the extra year? Because that obviously adds to the cost?

Mr. Johnson. It is pretty common in Ohio. We just went to licensure. So it is pretty rigorous, and we are not out of line with the other programs in trying to do that. So I do not think that it takes you significantly longer at the University of Cincinnati than it goes at other universities in Ohio to be able to do that.

Mr. Regula. You heard Aubrilyn talk about how important it was to have this early support system. Do you, as a university, try to provide some of that to your new graduates?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, we work with the various school districts. The program that we have, probably the most well developed program, is with Cincinnati Public Schools. They have

an internship or an induction year program, in which they work with the students. Then we also work with the students.

We also give our students some credit towards their Masters Degree, which has been a very good thing to do. Then what we do is, we encourage students to continue going. In Ohio, you must get your Masters Degree within five years after you get your degree. So we give them some credit, and then we work with them in a structured development.

We are also working with what we call cohort programs with the various superintendents, in which what we will do is tailor the Masters program specific to what they would like to see happen in their school district. Then they will help us get a cohort of teachers, that they will get Masters Degree in our university, but it will be working on, it could be literacy, or it could be the National Board certification.

In fact, I just met last week with a superintendent, and we are going to develop a program for school leaders; not administrators, but teacher leaders. She would like, since she is paying for her teachers to go back and get a Masters Degree, she would like us to tailor a program that they can become leaders in the classroom and do that.

So we are designing a specific program with that superintendent to do those kinds of things. In fact, I believe, as we have learned, that is the next forefront. We only can do so much with somebody; whether it be four years, five years, in trying to do that.

They really need to practice and learn. They have to have a school system that is willing to invest in term, in targeted development. It would be nice if you can get some credit and things like that for that. But there really needs to be life long learning of the teachers to moving forward.

Mr. Regula. Aubrilyn, first of all, do you think this is a good program? It is pretty obvious that you probably do. Would you change, if anything, on Teach for America, in the way it is structured?

Ms. Reeder. I think the one difficulty for me has been that because I have such a strong community within my school, which I feel like it is important for me to be a part of, it was more difficult for me in my first two years to be a part of that same community with Teach for America. Again, like I said, the experience was very overwhelming.

I think what I would like to see happen eventually, and I think that there are some attempts to do this, is to kind of marry these two ideas. When we are meeting with Teach for America teachers, we have veteran teachers there also. They are a part of this program that we are using. So they are a part of our program, as much as we are a part of their program.

Mr. Regula. Mr. Obey, we have got a few minutes, yet.

Mr. Obey. Dr. Johnson, how many new teachers are simply put on the job the first day with a sink or swim system, as opposed to getting the kind of guidance from senior teachers that you think is necessary or adequate?

Mr. Johnson. All programs, at least in Ohio, are to have mentoring programs in which teachers are not stuck in sink or swim kinds of situations. So theoretically, I would tell you that all teachers get some kind of support.

In reality, what we say we do and what we actually do is a

different story in trying to do this. I think that you will find that your most distressed school districts, in the school districts that have the most challenges, probably in those schools they have not as strong a support system for the teachers going forward. The most affluent school districts have the most solid programs.

So percentage wise, it is probably a bigger percentage than we should admit to.

Mr. Obey. What is the biggest weakness of schools of education?

Mr. Johnson. I think the biggest weakness is that we jump from one sexy idea to another sexy idea, and that we are looking for quick fixes; and that what it really is about. Again, you are talking to a blue collar guy.

It is really about getting people the right content knowledge, and making sure they are in those classes and doing what they need to do in those classes to learn about mathematics, to learn about science, to really working across, so that people are working together, so that the pedagogue that we are trying to teach, I am not teaching the same thing that he is teaching, or that he is teaching, because all three of our favorite topics to do, and to be partnering with the schools.

By the very nature of what I have described, I have got to work with arts and sciences faculty. I have got to work with my own faculty. I have got to work with school people. So I have got to manage collaborations across three different cultures, people with different reporting structures, to be able to do a good job in teaching. It is very, very hard work.

It is easier to jump on some band wagon and say whatever the ``thing du jour of the day'' is, that that is what we are going to do.

As I heard earlier this morning, I see where everything had to be graduate and our programs are going to be five and six year programs. Now I hear we are going to take people in six and eight weeks and just get smart people out in the schools.

Those are the kinds of shifts in extremes that I think are our biggest weakness, as opposed to getting down and really what the research tell us make a good teacher education program. Those things are not sexy in doing. They just require hard work and commitment.

Mr. Obey. Ms. Reeder, what is the most important thing that we could do to encourage, if not the brightest, at least the most interesting people to go into teaching?

Ms. Reeder. I think that this is one thing that Teach for America did very well. I think they came and they showed us a group of people that came to our campuses that really cared deeply about those students being successful, and about how it is not always easy to make that happen.

When you show that to somebody, when you say, you know what, this is a difficult situation, here is a challenge, and you show that to somebody interesting, they will take that challenge.

So I think the recruitment efforts are really important on those college campuses, in letting them know, you know what, we have some programs that are going to challenge you, and we are going to be asking a lot of you, when you are in this program.

Mr. Obey. I guess we have got to go vote.

Mr. Regula. Yes, we have to go. Do not go away, we will be back.

[Recess.]

Mr. Regula. Okay, I think we will go on with the rest of the panel, and then we will come back with questions for all of you.

So next is Dr. Thomas G. Carroll, Executive Director of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. That is a pretty big challenge.

Mr. Carroll. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for convening a panel on this issue, which we, of course, think is of utmost importance for improving schools.

The National Commission on Teaching in America's Future was built on decades of research that demonstrates what we all know from our own experience; which is, at the heart of every high performing school, we find high performing teachers. That is the center of success in schools, and that is where the Commission has put its energy and resources.

Six years ago, the Commission issued a challenge to the Nation, calling for every child to have a competent, caring, and qualified teacher; 2006 was our goal, a 10 year goal.

Now we have the No Child Left Behind Act, which issues a similar challenge to the Nation, and the same goals and the same kind of time frame.

The First Lady has called the No Child Left Behind Act a promise to America. We think that to redeem that promise, we have to find ways to work together, to join forces, really, to reach that goal.

The hallmark of our efforts ought to be collaboration and innovation. Those of us working in the area of teacher quality have a responsibility to listen to each other, to look to promising practices, whether in traditional approaches or alternative approaches, and to move beyond the differences that can set up back in our efforts to move on this issue.

We are trying to raise the bar and close the gap on student achievement. We have set high standards now for our students. To do that, we need to raise the bar and close the gap in teacher standards. We have not been as rigorous in insisting on high teacher standards as we have been in insisting on high student standards.

We need equally high standards for our teachers. We cannot tolerate a system in which the least qualified teachers, for example, are consistently placed in the schools that have the greatest challenge and the schools with the greatest learning needs.

There are five strategies that states and districts and colleges are pursuing around the country. I am just going to briefly summarize them. One is, setting high standards for licensing, and insisting on them; no more emergency certification, waivers of licensing.

We need to reform licensing in the states in this country. We talk about licensing first, and then we try to decide whether that really standards for qualified teaching. We ought to set some standards for qualified teaching, and then make sure that licensing means that we have got a qualified teacher in the classroom. The law calls for this, and we ought to do it.

High quality teacher preparation programs are the second strategy. We heard about one here in Cincinnati. There are other programs around the country. The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Southern Maine, the Georgia State system.

There are a number of programs in which there has been a clear institution-wide commitment, beyond the school of education, involving the chancellors, the leadership of the institutions, who make a commitment for arts and sciences faculty to work with schools of education, and for their college faculty to work with the K-12 schools.

So we do have inroads on teacher preparation improvement, but we need a much more vigorous effort to turn around the schools of education, a true institutional commitment at those places.

The third strategy is recruitment and retention. In the case of recruitment and retention, I believe that we could go a long way towards solving our teacher shortage problem, if we did more about the retention and attrition of teachers.

Our schools leak teaching talent like rusty pipes. We lose 30 to 50 percent of our teachers in the first three to five years. That is a horrendous number of people. It is a huge loss in public investment that we have made in the education of those teachers. It is tremendously disruptive of the learning in the children in those schools.

We are scrambling, trying to fill the shortage, when we should be trying to fix the real problem, which is the attrition problem. So that is the third strategy.

The fourth strategy is to reward accomplished teaching. If we want teaching to be a profession that is attractive to people like our colleagues here in your experience, the profession has to be a rewarding profession. There has to be an opportunity to advance, as a profession.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has put a set of standards in place that States are adopting across the country. We have 39 states now, and almost 200 school districts that have adopted that strategy for rewarding good teaching.

The final strategy is redesigning schools, so that teachers and students can succeed. Redesigning schools really means basically two things. First, it means smaller schools. We have extensive research. There is a great move now to build our education initiatives on a strong research base.

The research on small schools is overwhelming and convincing. In small schools, we have higher student achievement with lower gaps across ethnic groups. We have lower attrition rates. We have higher attendance rates. We have fewer discipline problems. We have higher teacher retention rates.

We just had a study released about a week ago or two weeks ago that was done at the University of Minnesota, following on the Columbine situation, funded by, I believe, the National Institutes of Health, maybe at CDC.

Again, what they found that made a difference in student engagement was small schools, the ability of students to feel like they were in a school where the teachers knew they were, and where the students felt engaged with their fellow students and with the teachers. So small schools make a difference, and we ought to move on that front.

The other thing that can make a difference in redesign is technology. Modern learning technologies, technology proficient teachers can make a tremendous difference in the education of our children. They bring resources to children who have been separated by a lot of barriers before, that have not had access to those resources.

So we need to build on our investment that we have made in the hardware in the schools, by investing in teacher professional development, so that the teachers know how to use that technology effectively.

Those are five strategies. This is a tall order. When we look at this, for all of our interest in Education in America, we have never built a system that has left no child behind. We have always had a system that has left children behind. It is not our intent, but that is what we have. If we are going to change that, we are talking about a big job.

The Federal Government which passed this act, with Congress and the Administration joining forces in a bipartisan initiative here, I think this is an unprecedented moment in education.

We need to follow through on the promise. For those reasons, I was disappointed to learn that the Administration's request is substantially less than the authorized figure, and that there are lists of programs. I heard a list this morning when I was here that are either slated to be frozen or simply cut.

I believe that educators around the country, who are working hard on all those initiatives that I just quickly reviewed, would be receiving the wrong message. I think that it would dilute the power, the momentum that was behind that bipartisan passage of the act.

So my hope is that committee, that the Congress, will find a way to keep the promise of the act, and to provide the funding that is needed to move on all of these fronts.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mr. Regula. Thank you.

Is your organization a 501(C)(3)?

Mr. Carroll. We are an organization that is based at Teacher's College at Columbia University. We are in the process of becoming a 501(C)(3), but we are equivalent to a research center at Teacher's College at Columbia University.

Mr. Regula. The Bill Gates Foundation would like your message on small schools. I put that on the wall back there as sort of a target.

Mr. Carroll. Yes, a small school.

Mr. Regula. That is actually a school house at the end of my lane. We live on a farm, and it has been abandoned, but it is in nice condition. I tried to get my children to go there, but it did not work. [Laughter.]

Mr. Regula. But there is a lot to be said for a good teacher.

Mr. Carroll. That is right.

Mr. Regula. And they had one like that.

Mr. Obey, I think you know the next witness.

Our next witness is Dr. Lew Finch, who is the Superintendent of Cedar Rapids Community School District. So we have been dealing in theory, and you are dealing in reality. So

we would be interested in your message.

Mr. Finch. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Obey, let me start my comments by saying I agree with Mr. Obey, when you talked about him requiring or advocating for better funding of this particular bill. So make sure you have got that in your record.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Finch. I am Lew Finch. I am superintendent of the Cedar Rapids Community School District in Iowa. We have about 18,000 students in our school district. I am in my 42nd year of service as a public school employee. While I have held the title of superintendent for 32 of those years, I considered myself, first and foremost, a teacher.

There have been times when the Teacher's Association did not agree with that. But the truth of the matter is, I still believe that I am a teacher, and I am proud of that. I have a daughter that is a teacher, and it has been our whole life.

I, too, applaud the President and Congress for their efforts on behalf of public schools in this country in passing the No Child Left Behind Act. I would just remind you that that has always been the mission of public schools. To the extent that we have not always been able to fulfill that mission, it is more a matter of us not having the resources and the support at times. It is not that we have not intended to want to do that.

I can assure you that in the classrooms of this country, teachers like Aubrilyn here are performing absolutely miracles with kids. It is going on every day.

Just a little side light on that, when is the last time you saw a ticker tape parade down Pennsylvania Avenue or Fifth Avenue on behalf of the public school teachers, who have made such a contribution to this country?

There are a couple of issues that I would like to address here today. You have my written testimony, so I am just going to highlight a couple of those.

One has to do with the issue of assessment and accountability. I just want to remind you and members of Congress that there is a difference between testing and assessment. There seems to be a great deal of emphasis on testing in this.

We give tests. Iowa ranks very high in performance on standardized tests. If you are going to judge the effectiveness of school districts simply on the basis of performance on standardized tests, we are sitting pretty well.

But we recognize in Iowa that there is more to an education and there is more to measuring the quality of an education than shows up on a norm reference to our criteria and referenced standardized tests.

So we would encourage you to really emphasize the fact that assessment really involves multiple indicators, and that we would like to have you, rather than making judgments about whether a school or a teacher or a group of students are successful or not, make sure you do that on the basis of multiple indicators. Be careful of focusing only a test score.

We seem to be a Nation wrapped up in this scoreboard mentality. We want to look up at the wall and see how the schools are rating, like we look at the NFL standards every week. That simply is not sufficient to job.

Secondly, the cost of testing is a concern. I will have to share with you that I and several of my colleagues are concerned that this may just be another under-funded mandate from the Federal Government.

If we are really going to fulfill the mandates here, it is going to require more tests, more testing, more scoring of tests, considerable more time spent on testing and assessment. We do not object to the idea of assessment. But for heaven sakes, do not require local school districts and States to divert precious resources from already short supplies of money for instruction. Devote it just to testing.

So I would encourage you to make sure that it is adequately funded. If you are going to require it, make sure to fund it. That is a message that comes from every school teacher and every board member and every superintendent in this country.

Other than that, with regard to the testing, I do not think that those of us in Iowa are overly concerned with it. It is interesting, because Iowa has a distinction, you know. It is the only State of the 50 States that does not have State-adopted standards.

We have come under tremendous criticism, out of Washington, D.C., and many other parts of the country by the fact that we have locally developed standards, not State standards.

Incidentally, you mentioned Columbine High School, prior to my coming to Cedar Rapids, I was the Superintendent of Schools in Jefferson County, Colorado, where Columbine High School is at. Fortunately, I had left a couple of years prior to the tragedy out there, but I know those people quite well. In fact, the little lapel symbol I have here is a Columbine High School memorial.

For those States that have adopted State standards, that is all well and good. But I can assure you that most of these standards, developed by local school districts in Iowa are more stringent and are higher standards than most of the State standards that have been adopted.

So we do have standards. It is just that we do not believe that the State ought to be setting those, but that the local people are in a better position to set those standards than the State or Federal Government.

So we are not concerned about the testing aspect of it so much, other than the fact that we do not want to focus just on standardized tests, and we would certainly like to see it adequately funded.

I think more importantly, and I do applause Congress and the President for their emphasis on quality educators. I would broaden that to include quality employees in our school district.

Most of the kids in our community get the start of their day seeing a bus driver. I am going to tell you, that bus driver can make or break that student's day. We want the absolute best possible people that we can have, working with those kids. Many of the kids relate better with the cook and the custodian than they do many of the professional staff.

So you have got to have people there that are competent and caring in every single position that we have.

Mr. Regula. Right.

Mr. Finch. But the focus really is on teachers and building

level administrators. We know that that is the secret to good schools. We applaud your efforts on that behalf.

I would just hasten to add that the President's budget simply does not adequately fund what we want to do, in terms of developing high quality educators. The \$2.85 billion sounds like a lot of money. It is a lot of money, but it is not nearly enough if we are really going to achieve what this bill hopes to achieve.

I would also hasten to add, there is a difference between licensure and quality. Going back to the testimony you have heard, we need to base licensure on those qualities that we know make up a good teacher, and not the other way around. There are many people that are licensed. They are not all high quality people.

So simply having a license now, I have to tell that every teacher we have employed in our school system is licensed. Not every school system can boast of that. But they are all licensed. Now I am not saying that they are all of equal quality, because there is a difference in the two.

I want to echo something else that has been brought up here today. If we are going to attract and retain the high quality teachers, especially teachers and administrators, in our lowest performing schools, this is not going to happen by punitive action.

I read the legislation, and all I see in there is what is going to happen to you, if you do not see the gains that we want. Where are the incentives? Who in the world is going to want to teach in the under-performing schools, with the few incentives that we have there? It is no wonder that we have our least experienced teachers too often teaching and working with our most needy students.

I would encourage you to build into your program incentives to help these people and given the recognition they need and, quite frankly, enable us or empower us to be able to create incentives for these people who want to teach, because there are many of these teachers who are dedicated and they want to be there.

But what I see in the provisions on this act are all kinds of punitive things. If you do not make the right gains on these tasks and the assessment, we are going to close your school, or we are going to let the parents send their kids off to some other school somewhere, where supposedly, they are going to get a better education.

It is full of punitive action and not enough incentive. I would encourage you to make sure to take a look at that.

I was interested in listening to the comments of those who are interested here and committed to teacher preparation. In Iowa, I would have to say that the teachers that we are able to attract and retain in our school system in Cedar Rapids are well prepared.

We have school districts from all over America come to Iowa to hire our teachers. They offer them big signing bonuses. They offer them all kinds of things to get them out to California, to Clark County, Nevada, Houston, Texas.

We have been very fortunate. While the pool of candidates has declined in our school district in the past couple of years, we still have been able to fill all of our positions

with licensed teachers and, for the most part, what we believe to be highly qualified people.

I would raise a concern, however, with regard to the implementation of the act as it relates to para-professionals in Title I.

Most of our para-professionals are one step above volunteers. We simply do not pay para-professionals or teacher aids or whatever you happen to call them, and the bill refers to them as para-professionals. We are attracting a pool of qualified candidates there that are going to meet the more stringent demands for para-professionals. That may be the most difficult part of this whole act for us to fulfill.

I do not know around the country whether or not other school districts are going to face the same problems that we do. But we certainly are going to find it very difficult.

I have not done an analysis of our para-professionals, to see how many of them might qualify, or whether or not we are going to be able to attract and retain those kinds of people.

But I guess the final thing that I would say to you is something that I have in my written testimony, and I want to repeat it here. We would not think of sending the members of our armed forces into harm's way without the absolute best training that we can give them, the best equipment that money can buy, the best technology, and the ongoing support. I think that is justified. That is correct.

Every day, we send into many public schools employees into facilities that are inadequate. They are crowded in some cases. They certainly do not have the latest technology in all of these classrooms. Even more importantly, they do not have the ongoing training and support that is absolutely essential, if we are really going to improve the performance of students in our schools.

So I would expect nothing less than the same commitment that we make to our military for our public schools. I realize, you know, it is a sizable bill. But if we are really serious about this, then we are going to make that commitment; because quality schools cost money, and people need to recognize that.

In summary, provide sufficient funding to cover the increased cost of testing. Do not pass that on to local districts. Commitment substantial and adequate resources to this whole endeavor of developing and retaining quality teachers and administrators. It is going to take a considerable investment, and that is the secret. That is the answer to improving education.

Require multiple indicators of success to evaluate the effectiveness of our schools. I listened to what Aubrilyn said that she does. I can assure you that, yes, those kids are probably going to perform better on a norm. referenced standardized test. But they gain a lot more than that, and it does not show up in a test score. I can tell you that from my own experience in being in those classrooms, day in and day out.

Then, finally, and perhaps as important as anything, provide incentives for our brightest and our best to want to work with our most needy children. I think that, in and of itself, will have a profound impact on our under-performing schools.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to be here.

Mr. Regula. I am going to let Aubrilyn answer your question, because you are in an inner city, are you not?

Ms. Reeder. Yes.

Mr. Regula. And she is staying there. What incentives could we do to keep people like you, who are invaluable in inspiring those kids, to stay?

Ms. Reeder. Thank you; I think one way would be opportunities for me personally during vacation times to further my professional development. There is a lot of professional development offered during the school day. It is very difficult to do that and manage a classroom, too.

The programs that I have gotten the most help out of and that have encouraged me to stay are the programs that offer money. I have gotten stipends for the programs from UCLA which have taught me, you know. I get college credit for them, also. So that is an incentive for constant learning, and I actually get paid for that time.

I think also it would be giving teachers some say in what they do. Because I am in an under-resourced school, the opportunities that have been given to me, because I am willing to spend the time to do it, you know, I am constantly being offered new challenges. I have to say, you know what, I am actually not going to take that one, because I am a little bit in over my head right now.

But having those opportunities, I mean, I am never going to hit the point where I am like, yes, I got it, you know, I have got everything down. No, I am constantly being challenged.

So I think the new opportunities, the opportunities for leadership, and the opportunities to become a really good teacher are all encouragers for me, at least. They are things that are going to encourage me to stay and keep on.

Mr. Finch. I would just add, she is also somewhat modest, too. I would say that recognition goes a long way. We were talking during the break here about the fact that I have seen teachers get a \$250 grant and do wonderful things. I had to do more with the recognition that they got the grant and were able to do some special things. They made \$250 stretch further than any finance officer I have ever had in a school district. It was absolutely wonderful.

I would add to what Aubrilyn has to say about giving teachers adequate time; pay them to go back and give them opportunities to go back for that re-training, because no matter how good the teacher is, ongoing training and staff development is absolutely essential.

I have people call me and say, well, they can do that in the summer on their own time or on the weekend or at night, at their own expense, and that is just nonsense. That is absolute nonsense. No major corporation in America requires all of its people to do it on their own time at their own expense. So that takes resources and we need it.

Mr. Regula. You might recruit Aubrilyn for your school while you are here.

Mr. Finch. Right, I am trying to do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. Regula. I have one further question. This year's new budget zeros out, Ready to Teach; zeros out, National Writing Project; American History; Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use

Technology; School Leadership; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Now my question to you is, obviously, it is in the 2002 bill. Does your district get any of this money; and if so, how much; and do you think these programs are worthwhile? Because obviously, somebody at OMB decided they were not?

Mr. Finch. Well, the programs are worthwhile. In Cedar Rapids, we do not get a lot of funding, at any Federal level. Less than five percent of our budget comes from Federal funding, and most of that is Title I.

In Title II, we do the class size reduction. We employee around 16 teachers, using that money, and the State of Iowa matched that. So we were able to employ about 30 teachers on class size reduction.

We do not get a lot of the funding of the programs you have just cited. But I can tell you from my own experience in talking with my colleagues in districts where they do get access to that, particularly the technology, it has had a profound impact on that.

I would have to say, other than the concentrating on the quality of the teachers and the administrators we have employed, I really believe technology holds the promise for some tremendous things in our schools.

If you go back to the personal testimony that you heard about what the kids would say to us is, get a life. Read a book? I go over and I access the world.

I will just use one little thing about this. I walked into a science classroom and watched a very good science teacher teaching about the functioning of the kidneys. He went over to the wall chart and pulled down the old chart, you know, with the diagram here. He took out his pointer and pointed to the kidneys, and the kids were like this.

Why; because most of them had been in a virtual reality game at the mall the night before, and they were coming and looking at a wall chart about the functioning of the kidneys; when today, you can take a virtual tour of the kidneys, if you have technology in the classroom. Was it the teacher's fault; of course not.

Mr. Carroll. Mr. Chairman, just one thing I would add is that our concern on the technology is that the country really, in every State and every district now and at the Federal level, has made a huge investment in hardware in the infrastructure. But our investment in professional development for teachers to use that technology effectively has not been there.

The Center for Education Statistics says that 20 to 30 percent of the teachers feel comfortable and know how to use that technology for instruction. So we have got our investment, and we are not able to use it effectively. That is why programs to do the professional development with the technology are so important.

Mr. Johnson. We have one of those PT-3 grants. It is my understanding that we are likely to get a little bit more funding; maybe not. It has been an incredible impact.

It is just unfortunate, if we are talking about faculty who now have to teach this, and they are my age or older, it is the same issue. They need to understand the technology.

So if we do not focus on that, then it becomes just

punitive of what is wrong with colleges of education; what is wrong with what we need to do. It has had a very big impact at our university in trying to help our faculty get up to snuff.

Mr. Regula. I just remember, as an elementary principal, each time I went to a new school, I would look in the closet, and it would be full of all kinds of the technology of that age, but nobody knew how to use it adequately.

Mr. Johnson. Yes.

Mr. Finch. It was those Wallensach reel-to-reel tape recorders, is what you were talking about. [Laughter.]

Mr. Regula. Mr. Obey?

Mr. Obey. Dr. Finch, I am worried about you catching your plane. I think any time you feel you have to leave, you ought to just get up and leave.

Mr. Finch. Thank you.

Mr. Obey. I have just one overarching question. Everybody says, run Government like a business. So let us look at education as a business, in which teachers are the assets that we are trying to develop and use.

In terms of looking at the raw material, what is the one thing you would do to attract the most imaginative and the brightest teachers to teaching?

If you are looking at the manufacturing process--how we train them, what is the one thing you would do to improve the way we train teachers?

If you look at them as developed assets, how would you change schools to make the most use of the talents of good teachers?

Lastly, how would you keep your best assets, so that you do not have so many good teachers leaving before they have even been in the system three years?

Mr. Finch. I will take a shot at that, and then I will have to excuse myself. I have to catch a plane to Chicago, that I hear there are supposed to be delays this afternoon, so that will be interesting.

In a nutshell, compensation is a part of it. I know that the teachers sometimes are a little hesitate to point that out.

We start our teachers under \$30,000. The average teachers in our district, with many, many years of experience and advanced degrees, many of them with Masters and Doctors Degrees, after 25 or 30 years, maybe make \$40,000. I mean, it is criminal, and that is apart of it. It just has to be there.

Then I want to repeat what Aubrilyn has said about what would keep her in the profession and what makes it worthwhile. Teachers, like anyone else, want to have something to say about what it is that they do. Teaching in a classroom, a fourth grade classroom can be a pretty lonely place, if you really do not have the opportunity to team and to work with your colleagues, and have a say about what it is that you are going to be doing.

I think those are the working conditions that I think will attract and retain our competent and most highly qualified teachers.

Just let me give you one little story. When I was a superintendent in a large suburban Minneapolis school district, I had the CEO from 3-M say to me just what you said. Why do we not run these schools like a business? You know, at 3-M, we do these wonderful things.

I said, okay, here is the deal. You are absolutely right. Let us say that you are the plant manager here, and your job is to make the world's finest adhesive tape.

Then in the plant comes 400,000 gallons of glue that has been out in Minnesota winter and it is all crystallized, and then through the next door is 400 tons of plastic that that is supposed to be applied to. Your job is to make the world's finest adhesive tape. What would you do?

He said, I would throw out that material and start over. I said, every day in America's public schools, we have kids who are crystallized and hurting. These teachers are working miracles with them.

Then he looked at me and he said, how do you people do that? I said, well, it is because we have people like this who have committed their lives to working with those kids.

We do not throw out, thank God, the raw material, and say, okay, send us better material. They are already sending us their best. We need to pick them up where they are at.

For those of you who had the opportunity to hear the Teacher of the Year, I saw him interviewed on CNN, and he was just recognized at the White House this morning. He said, you know, every child has assets. There are positive things about every child. The way I approach this is that I can build on the positive aspects of every child, and I forget about the things that they cannot do. I think that that is the theory and the kind of system that we are trying to get.

Again, I apologize for having to leave, but I really do appreciate it, and I really enjoyed your one room country school there.

Mr. Regula. You probably started close to that.

Mr. Finch. It was pretty close.

Mr. Carroll. Well, Mr. Obey, your question is an appropriate question. Because I think, you know, the comparison is with the business community. I think that is every other profession, when we have a shortage or we need more professionals, what we do is, we increase compensation and we do everything we can to make the employment, the working conditions attractive.

But what we are prone to do in too many cases in teaching is to just lower the standards, just lower the bar, so that we can get more people in by lowering the thresholds. That cannot be the solution; lowering the threshold cannot be the solution.

I would add that compensation is important. I would also add that the working conditions are important. The conditions that Aubrilyn was talking about are the conditions of a professional; the opportunity to have a voice in the work place, to work in a professional community in the school, in which the teacher's collaborate, work together to define the learning environment.

I think that there are other incentives that we have at our means of some simply, well targeted strategies, such as the loan forgiveness programs and tuition assistance programs, especially at the Federal level, where you cannot be involved in the compensation, but you can be involved in loans and grants for service.

We ought to be thinking about service scholarships for entering into teaching. This idea, I think, that the President

has proposed of increasing the level of loan forgiveness to \$17,000, I believe, it is, if a person agrees to teach in a high need area, a shortage area; either a discipline or a community where there is a shortage of teachers. Those strategies would make teaching attractive.

I think another way to say this is, we have talked about some of these schools as hard to staff schools. Then we try to think about, what can we do to get teachers to work in hard to staff schools.

What you are really saying is, we ought to change the schools so that they are not hard to staff. We should change the conditions in those schools that make them so difficult to work in. The leadership in those schools is essential.

A strong principal who is a real teaching, educational leader is just essential. Every time you see a high performing school and you see a cadre of teachers who have really jelled and who are sticking with it, you see a principal who is backing them.

So investing in leadership, I think, is also crucial here. We think of always investing in the teachers, but we have got to invest in the school leaders as well, if we want this to work.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I know I have to be somewhere in about 10 minutes, so I have time for about one more question. I am trying to figure out which one I want to ask. I have seven or eight of them here.

Often, when we ask about shortfalls in the Administration's budget, we are told, well, you can take care of that, because you have got some flexibility in Title I, et cetera.

My concern is, how do schools that do not have a lot of poor children and do not qualify for Title I funds and are not very well off suburban schools going to bear the burden of these new mandates in H.R. 1. What kind of pressures will develop in schools like that, which cannot access programs like Title I very heavily?

Mr. Carroll. Those schools are kind of caught in between. You know, they would not necessarily be targeted as low income schools, but they do not have the resources of the other schools.

I think, in general, the burden is significant. You asked the question several times, once this morning and once this afternoon, how many teachers could meet the requirements of the act today.

My estimates, using the Department of Education's numbers is that there probably are about two-thirds of the teachers at the high school level, who have the qualifications to teach, meaning that they have the requirements of the law.

They have a major in their discipline or a minor that discipline to teach. That means there might be a third of those high school teachers who are not qualified, by the terms of the law now. That is based on the schools and staffing the survey, the most recent data from the department.

Generally, maybe seven percent of the teaching population, in its entirety is unlicensed, uncertified. If we go to the entry level point, the teachers who are just entering the building on their first three years, again, it could be one-third of those teachers who are not going to meet the requirements of the law. That is based on the National Center

for Education Statistics condition of education report from 2000.

So there is a significant burden that I think our schools face, if they are going to bring teachers up to standards that are called for in the law. I think there are some efficiencies that come again with the notion of school redesign, moving to smaller schools; schools in which the professional development that people talked about this morning, where the professional development is imbedded in the school.

It is imbedded in the day-to-day work of the teachers, so that there are mentor teachers, who are master teachers, who are accomplished teachers in the school, who are mentoring the younger teachers, so that it is part of their day-to-day work.

We are going to have to find, in the face of resource constraints at all levels, at the States and in the Districts with economy, economies that involve in those schools building this professional development into the day to day work, creating a professional community, if you will, in which teachers collaborate collegiately to support each other.

But my concern, I think, as I said in my remarks is that the challenge of the law is right. This is the right law. It says that every teacher in every classroom should be qualified. Right now, every teacher is not. It is a significant burden to get there.

Mr. Johnson. I think you will find that schools will pick three strategies, or at least three strategies, as they go through them. One, they will pass on some costs to parents. For example, you will now pay for band, if your son is going to be in band, or your daughter is going to be in band; or there will be a fee for football.

There will be this and that. They will justify it in the sense that, well, that is an extracurricular activity, although that would have been something that would have been covered.

So they will find things that they can pass on. You may even find that you are buying materials like workbooks and things like that. So they will pass that on. They will find ways around it.

When you asked this morning, and I am not sure who asked this, this morning, to get data on how many teachers are teaching out of field, I guarantee you that what you get back, the problem is a lot worse than that.

Because what superintendents do, and this is not a slam on superintendents, it is how they survive, they do things like, there is a certain set of requirements to be a sub. So they hire people as substitute teachers. You are just in the classroom all year. So technically, you are not out of field in trying to do that.

So you are going to find that whatever you find, that it is much harder. So we find ways to get around the laws. Third, there will be local taxes, however they might do it, referendums and things raised to try and meet these mandates.

Mr. Carroll. And I think the fourth would be that there will just be cuts in those schools.

Mr. Johnson. That is right.

Mr. Carroll. They will just cut services and activities and programs.

Mr. Obey. That is what is happening in my State.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time. I have to leave, but thank you all. We appreciate your coming.

Mr. Regula. I think this has been a great hearing. I have got the testimony of the four of you, which I will read in full on the airplane, because you caught my interest, to a high degree.

We have another appointment, but I have one question. Did your principal help you in meeting the challenges as a new teacher in a rather difficult environment?

Ms. Reeder. Not so much directly; although I do remember my first year, a very specific instance. I was having difficulty. I had an eighth grade home room, who knew a lot more than I did about the school.

When I said, listen, I need some help with parent phone calls, he immediately came in there and said, you tell me who you need so that you be successful here.

So I gave him two names. He found two veteran teachers that were willing to take on these more challenging students. You know, home room is not something that I should be worrying about that much anyway. So that was one thing that he did very directly.

My school had actually just gone through a cycle of three different principals. He was the last one, and he is the one that stayed. So I think his support of all of the teachers and the other teacher leaders, I mean, there was just a re-awakening at the school that year.

I think that while I may not have felt all that support, whatever they said, if they said, we need this for teachers, he said, okay. He listened to the people that had been at that school, and had put all their heart into that school. So I think indirectly, he supported it in that way, too.

Mr. Regula. Dr. Carroll, you have touched on the fact that leadership is such an important thing. So I would ask you, Dr. Johnson, do you have programs to educate principals, and perhaps mentors, in the larger system?

Mr. Johnson. Yes, we do, and the challenges of providing effective administrators are equal or more difficult than finding effective teachers and training them.

I could talk to you about our programs in which we have a grow your own strategy with Warren County, which are some of the more suburban counties and rural counties on the outside. We are working with the Superintendents there, and they are identifying teacher leaders, and trying to get those individuals to do this.

But we need a whole different way of administrators to be thinking about it. It is not just the fiscal management of the building. It is the educational leadership to be able to support a new teacher; to be able to do all of those kinds of things. That is not how all of our administrators have been trained in the past.

Mr. Regula. Well, we have heard this fact that this may be one of the places that we need to direct our attention, on the school leadership; i.e., superintendents and principals.

Our programs in the bill, thus far, are all aimed at the teacher. Should we be thinking about some kind of program with some financial incentives in our bill to encourage the development of good leadership?

Mr. Johnson. I would say absolutely, yes. I would agree with my colleagues, if you find an effective school, it is going to be a rare instance that you find an effective school that has a poor leader, in trying to do that. You may find wonderful teachers, that are being undermined by somebody who does not know what they are doing, rightly or wrongly, in trying to do that.

But it will be rare instance where you find an effective school that does not have a good leader; and we need to be having more leaders in the program. You were a principal. There is no more thankless job.

When you look at the kind of administrative skills that you need to do to be a principal, you can make a heck of a lot more money managing some other program out there and doing some other kind of thing. It is very, very, very tough work for somebody to come into, and we ought to be finding ways to encourage leaders.

I think we ought to also be finding ways to develop, and this is where some of our innovative superintendents are focusing on, on teacher leaders, teachers in the schools. I think as we go back, giving teachers control, having teachers feel like they are part of the decision making, that they feel in control goes a long way to attracting people into your profession.

If what you hear is that education is awful, and if what you feel is that when you are in there, all these decisions are made and you accept what happens in the classroom, it becomes a lonely profession and not very attractive.

But if you feel that, in fact, you are making a difference, if you feel you have a level of control, you are more likely to be involved and want to stay involved in that.

The compensation, I would agree, is important. But I think building teacher leadership and having people feel in control of what they are doing, that is what all of us want to feel.

Mr. Regula. That is very hearing. This has been a great hearing. You have all been terrific. I wish we could have had all of our colleagues here today, because this is the real world.

When someone this morning said that our schools have failed, I said I was down at the IMAX movie, and I recommend it to you, down at the Air and Space, in which they show the development, and it is actually the footage, a lot of it is in the space capsule.

The genius involved in putting that thing up there is enormous, enormous. It is the same thing with computers. Our schools have produced a lot of very able people in this country. As we mentioned about the ticket tape parade, but that person would not be there without a good teacher or teachers along the way, that made it possible for that individual.

So you were all great today. I just appreciate your being here. It was an excellent hearing. The committee is adjourned.

Thursday, April 25, 2002.

HIGH SCHOOL AND TRANSITION INTO THE WORKFORCE

WITNESSES

SALLY STROUP, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
GROVER J. WHITEHURST, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND
IMPROVEMENT
SUSAN B. NEUMAN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION
ROBERT H. PASTERNAK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
CAROL D'AMICO, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
THOMAS P. SKELLY, DIRECTOR, BUDGET SERVICE

Chairman's Opening Remarks

Mr. Regula. We'll get started. We will probably have a few interruptions this morning with votes. We appreciate your all being here again. We've had interesting discussions, Carol, I think you're new to the panel. So you'll have maybe a different point of view. We'll be very interested in what all of you have to say about this subject, which happens to be one of interest to me. I was, as a State senator, very responsible for getting a technical school started in our district which now has an enrollment of 5,000 students and about a 97 percent placement rate.

So it is the kind of thing that serves the community needs very well. Ours is not a community college, it's strictly an associate degree. The interesting thing is, we're getting a number of students enrolling who have a bachelor's and come back to get job producing education. So we look forward to your testimony and that of your colleagues. You can summarize your statement as you choose.

Opening Remarks of Assistant Secretary D'Amico

Ms. D'Amico. Thank you, and good morning. I'm pleased to appear before you and the Committee to discuss the programs administered by the Office of Vocational and Adult Education that focus on high schools and transition into the work force. I do have a full testimony that I would ask be incorporated into the record.

Mr. Regula. Without objection.

Ms. D'Amico. The first important step of the President's program in education was embodied in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. It's built on four key principles that we will adhere to as we discuss high school and transition into the work force. First, closing the achievement gaps, especially among those of different ethnic groups and socioeconomic status. Second, focusing on effective practices and what works. Third, increasing flexibility and reducing bureaucracy. And fourth, providing more options for parents and students.

These are the principles that will guide our thoughts about the programs in our Office of Vocational and Adult Education. Our goal is to ensure that these important principles, embraced by the Congress and the President, are also reflected in efforts to improve dramatically the preparation of adults and students in high schools and community colleges and their transition into the work force.

Our first challenge is high school excellence. As you know, despite nearly 20 years of education reform and innovation, millions of America's young adults leave high school without the knowledge and skills needed for success in the work place or postsecondary education. We know too well the challenges of declining achievement throughout the high school years, the lack of competitiveness of U.S. students relative to their peers across the globe, and unacceptably high school dropout rates.

Given our current economic projections and trends, young adults will face advances in technology and globalization of the economy unimaginable to earlier generations. And the demand for low-skill, less educated labor will increasingly give way to demand for highly skilled, highly educated workers. More companies will cross national boundaries to get the work that they need done. Good jobs, those with meaningful career paths and family supporting incomes, will go to those with strong academic and technical skills, especially in math, science and technology.

Since employers who do not find skilled workers here at home will look for them abroad, our challenge is to make sure that we have a competitive work force here in the U.S. There is a projected serious shortfall of qualified workers over the next 10 to 20 years. One projection was 12 million workers without the qualifications they need for the new economy. So the challenge to us is clear. Too many high schools are failing to prepare their students for the future. Good schools do exist, but they continue to be the exception.

ROLE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Our postsecondary institutions will also play an increasingly critical role in addressing the challenges of fulfilling our work force needs, specifically, our Nation's more than 1,100 community colleges. Because of population increases----

Mr. Regula. When you use that number in community colleges, does that include those that are standalone technical institutes?

Ms. D'Amico. That would include both.

Mr. Regula. Both. Okay.

Ms. D'Amico. That's correct. Because of the population increases and increased college attendance rates, more American youth are enrolling in postsecondary education than ever before. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that 70 percent of the fastest growing jobs in the new economy over the next 10 years, such as in the information technology and health professions, will require some kind of postsecondary education and training beyond high school, not necessarily a bachelor's degree, but some postsecondary education and training beyond high school.

Increasingly, we are looking to community colleges to train the work force. Yet many of the community colleges do not have the capacity to fulfill their potential in the areas of education, career preparation and work force development. Community colleges have multiple missions, from being the first

entry point for postsecondary education for many young adults, to retraining the work force. Many State policies and Federal policies were created in a different era, not necessarily for the needs that we have today. We need to examine what those are, so that we can enhance the community colleges' mission of preparing the work force.

TRANSITIONING ADULTS INTO THE WORKFORCE

It is also difficult to measure the quality of community colleges, in large part because of the multiple missions they have and the diversity of student goals and needs. Since our office also administers adult education programs, I can't resist mentioning the challenges we have with transitioning millions of adults into the labor force. The 1992 national assessment of adult literacy indicated that approximately 90 million adults were reading at levels that were insufficient to participate fully in the economy and for the skills they need. The 2002 updated version of that survey will be conducted. And it is likely to indicate that we'll still have millions of adults who continue to have low literacy rates.

Currently, our programs serve about 2.7 million of those adults, if you count State and local resources. So we are serving a fraction of the need, and that really demands two levels of response. First, we need to make sure that the current services are of the highest possible quality, reflecting the best known research about adult learning and having a clear focus with specific objectives for each adult education class that is offered. This requires clear expectations, good curriculum and assessments, well-trained teachers and an accountability system to measure and report on student progress.

Second, we need to make sure that we have a broad array of services available to adult learners who are currently not accessing learning. That's why we are developing national activities around the role of work place education, community and faith-based organizations as providers of rigorous training, on research practices, and on the use of technology in providing adult education literacy.

We also have the challenge of preparing limited English proficient adults in the work place and to prepare them for their lives in American society. That is part of what we do in the adult education program. In recent years, the States have experienced a growth of more and more adults who need English literacy coming to the programs.

Finally, I want to talk about accountability for these programs. A guiding principle of this Administration is to focus on the results of our efforts. The 1998 reauthorization of the Vocational and Adult Education statutes included accountability requirements focusing on student achievement and other measures. One of Secretary Paige's key strategies for the Department of Education is that we move beyond a culture of compliance to a culture of results.

An accountability system is only worthwhile if it is measuring the right things, and if the data it produces are actually being used by teachers and administrators to improve quality. So we will be working to ensure that we have an

accountability system that meets those criteria.

The Office of Vocational and Adult Education is now working to build on the No Child Left Behind Act by developing policy recommendations for high schools, community colleges and adult learning centers to transition into the work force. Our goal is to create incentives and opportunities for States and local reform efforts focused on preparing every American to complete high school and be well prepared for postsecondary education and employment; to support community and technical colleges to fulfill their potential in the areas of education, career preparation and work force development; and to expand adult learning to bring high levels of literacy and English fluency to millions of under-served Americans.

This effort comes at a critical time, as Congress prepares to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the Higher Education Act. We are enthusiastic about these opportunities facing us. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I would be happy to respond to any questions that you might have.

[The prepared statement of Assistant Secretary D'Amico:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Are the other members of the panel going to testify? If so, we'll go ahead and then save the questions.

Opening Remarks by Assistant Secretary Stroup

Ms. Stroup. Good morning. It's a pleasure to see you again today, Chairman Regula, to talk about the budget for the Office of Postsecondary Education and the programs that we believe do the right things that need to be done in preparing high school and college students to transition into the work force.

COLLEGE ENROLLMENT AND COMPLETION GAPS

College preparation is the focus of several of the programs that we administer in the Office of Postsecondary Education. College enrollment and completion gaps are still a significant problem, particularly between low income students and their more advantaged peers, and minority and non-minority students. Oftentimes they are directly related to the level of academic preparation these students receive in high school. Many of them have lower educational expectations and they are less likely to take courses needed for college.

TRIO AND GEAR UP

Three of our programs, including Upward Bound and Talent Search--which are two TRIO programs--and the Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP), specifically address those problems by providing a wide range of intervention services to disadvantaged middle and high school students. Using different approaches, these programs

provide tutoring, counseling, mentoring, academic advice, financial aid, counseling and other information that will help these students pursue a postsecondary degree.

The President's budget for 2003 proposes to continue funding TRIO at \$802.5 million, and GEAR UP at \$285 million. The \$400 million in TRIO that's allocated to Upward Bound and Talent Search serves 432,000 high school students across the country. GEAR UP, with its \$285 million and the matching contributions that are part of that program, serves 1.4 million middle school and high school students. That is an increase of 135,000 over the last year.

We're currently looking at both of these programs to try to figure out where we're failing and where we're succeeding, so that we have good performance data for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and we can figure out where we need to target the money so it actually helps the students we're trying to reach and get into college.

COLLEGE ACCESS

On the access side for us, as Carol said, postsecondary education is probably more important than ever for transitioning to the workforce. We know that people who have bachelor's degrees earn significantly more than people with high school diplomas. We know that people with bachelor's degrees have a significantly less unemployment problem than people with just high school diplomas.

PELL GRANTS AND OTHER STUDENT AID

The budget this year provides almost \$55 billion in student aid for postsecondary education and includes \$10.9 billion for Pell Grants, the main Federal grant program, to help low income students enroll in college. The current number puts us at about 4.5 million students eligible for Pell Grants.

Mr. Regula. If I'm not mistaken, that includes technical schools.

Ms. Stroup. Yes, it does. Students enrolled in a program that leads to an associate or bachelors degree, or a certificate are eligible for Pell Grants.

To supplement the Pell Grant funds, we are also continuing support for the Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant at \$725 million and Federal Work-Study at slightly over a billion dollars. Again, all colleges are eligible to participate in the campus-based programs, including technical and public colleges, and 2-year community colleges.

The budget also has \$100 million for----

Mr. Regula. Excuse me, is that money disbursed by the college?

Ms. Stroup. Yes. That's part of the campus-based system, where the institutions determine which students get the aid, based on rules to target aid to low-income students.

Mr. Regula. So they could give that aid to a student who's also getting a Pell Grant?

Ms. Stroup. Yes. This supplements Pell. You can get a Pell Grant, you can get a Perkins loan, and you can get an SEOG Grant. As a matter of fact, we tie SEOG and Pell together to

make sure the SEOG is targeted to the neediest students.

Mr. Regula. Why shouldn't we have it all in one place? Why all this proliferation of programs?

Ms. Stroup. In the past, people have suggested taking campus-based programs and merging them into one program instead of having three: SEOG, Perkins and Work-Study. I think most of the colleges have opposed that idea in the past. They didn't want them all merged together. They generally like the separate line item programs. To some extent, they do different things. They're not used for the same thing. Work-Study is a clear example. It's not really a grant program, you get the money but you also do a job, either on campus or off campus or at a community-based organization.

Mr. Regula. So the student goes to the financial aid office, and they've got an array of----

Ms. Stroup. Yes, pots of money to pick from to make awards to students.

Mr. Regula. I suppose the colleges like the idea of being able to----

Ms. Stroup. They do.

Mr. Regula [continuing]. Play with all these various things.

Ms. Stroup. Yes. It gives colleges flexibility to spread it out. There are some colleges that tell us that when you give all of the money to the lowest income kids, there are students on the border. It's the kids from the lower middle income who may get squeezed out of Pell who then get the benefits of some of the campus-based programs. Colleges do spread the aid around. A Perkins loan is a perfect example. You can give a student a \$4,000 Perkins loan, the average is about \$1,000. So clearly the colleges are spreading the funds around among students.

Mr. Regula. Is that loan repayable?

Ms. Stroup. Yes. Students must repay a Perkins loan to the institution.

Mr. Regula. Okay. Would that be what you call a student loan program?

Ms. Stroup. No. It is a student loan program, but it's a campus-based program. It's not one of the big student loan programs--the Federal Family Education Loans and the Federal Direct Student Loans. It's a separate campus-based program where the schools actually administer the loan program themselves. They receive a pot of money, and they have to add money to it. It requires a match from the campus. They have to put their money into it and use it as a revolving fund to make student loans.

Mr. Regula. Do they set the interest rate and the repayment terms?

Ms. Stroup. Most of that is set in law and regulations.

Mr. Regula. On Perkins?

Ms. Stroup. Yes, on Perkins. We set most of the rules. Again, this is one I talked about yesterday that has cancellation rights for teachers and other professionals, such as nurses. The campuses actually get to administer it and determine who gets the loans.

Mr. Regula. So that's the one that the program for loan forgiveness would be addressed to?

Ms. Stroup. That's part of the loan forgiveness program. But there are loan forgiveness programs available in the big loan program I talked about yesterday that are for all student loans.

Mr. Regula. It's a little confusing.

Ms. Stroup. It is. Sometime maybe we should talk about merging those programs again when higher education comes up for reauthorization.

Mr. Regula. I'll suggest to my colleagues we take a look at it.

Ms. Stroup. That's probably a good idea.

I'll quickly go through the rest of my statement. In the big student loan program, as I was saying, we expect nearly 11 million student loans to be made, \$40.7 billion in the student loan programs--the Federal Family Education Loan and Federal Direct Student Loan programs which the Administration is supporting.

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Another educational need that I just want to mention is one that you actually addressed last year in the appropriations bill. And it has to do with the aftermath of September 11th and the importance of strengthening American international expertise in world areas, economies and foreign languages. We got more money last year for those programs, and we're asking for a 4.1 percent increase, for a total of \$102.5 million, to expand the opportunities for people to study, particularly the less commonly known foreign languages.

While No Child Left Behind is really the start of improving education, vocational education, adult education, and higher education, all have an important role to play if this is going to work across the country. We believe that greater accountability is needed at the postsecondary level as well.

Mr. Regula. So No Child Left Behind is the testing program and accountability is, are there similar criteria on the student, all these various post-high school programs?

Ms. Stroup. We don't have testing programs in the postsecondary world. To get student aid, obviously you must be admitted into college in the first place to be eligible.

Mr. Regula. Right.

Ms. Stroup. And to continue to get student aid once you're enrolled, you do have to meet certain academic progress standards and make sure you're actually progressing through the course you're enrolled in.

Mr. Regula. That's an ongoing process?

Ms. Stroup. That's an ongoing process, that's correct. So we don't have an entrance exam or an exit exam. But it is an ongoing enrollment process where you have to show that you're making academic progress, or you would lose your financial aid.

Anyway, let me just close so we can go on to somebody else, and say, we're in the throes of looking at reauthorizing the Higher Education Act. It's going to be up next year. We have to make changes to meet the demands of the new economy. And we'll be doing that in the next year.

[The prepared statement of Assistant Secretary Stroup follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. You all will be testifying in front of John Boehner's committee.

Ms. Stroup. At some point in time, yes, we will.

Mr. Regula. If they get around to it.

Ms. Stroup. Yes.

Mr. Regula. Okay.

Bob, Mr. Pasternack.

Opening Remarks of Assistant Secretary Pasternack

Mr. Pasternack. Call me Bob, Mr. Chairman. It's your hearing room, it's fine. Thank you again for the opportunity to be here this morning.

SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

I want to talk to you at the outset about something that we talked a little bit about yesterday. And that is, no matter what we do in law, no matter what we do in regulation, no matter what we do in funding, if we don't have highly qualified teachers working with our kids, we're never going to get the kinds of improved results that the American people have a right to demand.

In the area of transition, we're talking about taking students with disabilities from school to the world of work, or from school to postsecondary education. The fact that teachers have to collaborate with other outside agencies, the fact that teachers have to help kids with disabilities find employment, these are very difficult tasks to accomplish. One of the things that we didn't get a chance to talk enough about yesterday is the fact that it requires that the university help us in delivering the kinds of instruction to these people so that they can have the skills to be able to go out and do a better job of working with the kids that are in front of them on a daily basis.

I'm not being critical of our teachers. I'm very proud of the work that goes on across America in special education classrooms every day. But, it's just such a complex set of requirements when we're talking about moving kids from school to postsecondary opportunities or from school to work. It's a critical area that we've got to do a better job in.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

We've seen improvements in the graduation rate for students with disabilities. We're about to release to you and your colleagues the 23rd annual report to Congress on how we're doing with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. You're going to see that the graduation rate for students with disabilities has climbed to an all time high, but it's only 57.8 percent. So while we can say that it's the best it's ever been, clearly if we're going to accomplish the President's mandate of leaving no child behind, we've got to do a better

job of getting kids with disabilities to complete school.

I know that you are particularly aware that if a child doesn't have a high school diploma, it really changes their life trajectory. It puts them at risk for getting into the mental health system, which I know your colleague Mr. Kennedy is particularly concerned about. It puts them at risk of getting into the juvenile justice system, and in alarming numbers we're seeing younger people going into the adult criminal justice system as well. These are things that we absolutely have to do a better job of as we move forward.

ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES

One of the things that we're going to be trying to do is identifying better ways of teaching adolescents and adults the kinds of skills that they need to be able to complete school. With some of the money that we received to do some of the important research activities--and I know Russ will talk more about that in a minute--we've looked at a longitudinal study on adults with disabilities. Because while we've talked a lot about leave no child behind, we also have a responsibility to serve adults with disabilities.

And as you know, sir, there are 54 million adults with disabilities across this great country of ours. In his first month in office, the President released a new freedom initiative. And the new freedom initiative documents the appalling fact that 70 percent of adults with disabilities are unemployed at a time of unprecedented economic prosperity.

So not only have we left kids out and kids behind, but we've left a lot of adults out and a lot of adults behind. One of the things that we need to do a much better job of is encouraging the business community and the public sector to understand that disability is not inability, and that people with disabilities can accomplish great things, and can contribute to the work force if they're given meaningful work and opportunities to deliver that meaningful work.

If we look back at one of the things we've learned from a longitudinal study of adults with disabilities in our voc-rehab system, which I also have responsibility for administering, we find out that the best predictor of subsequent employability is literacy skills--an area that my colleague Susan is passionate about.

So one of the challenges for us is, if we know that we need to teach adults with disabilities how to read, how do we do that? Where are the effective models to be able to teach adults with disabilities how to read, when they've spent time in school and haven't learned how to read and they've gone into voc-rehab programs and haven't learned how to read? We've got to do a better job at helping people in the field learn from good, rigorous, methodologically sound research what strategies can they bring to work with these adults with disabilities who clearly need to learn how to read if we're going to enhance their ability to be employed.

SPECIAL EDUCATION NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

That's one of the ties to our Part D program, which is a

critically important part of what we do under the IDEA. It gives us our personnel preparation funding, but it also gives us some of our research money and allows us to put research into practice, which is something I know you're particularly interested in.

In the interest of time, I just want to tell you that we need to do a better job of increasing the graduation rate for kids with disabilities. Because we know that if a kid doesn't have a diploma, their life trajectory is significantly different and it's something that we're very concerned about and look forward to working with you and your staff to help the field do a better job.

[The prepared statement of Assistant Secretary Pasternack follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

DROPOUTS IN BIG CITIES

Mr. Regula. Do you have statistics on the non-graduates or the dropouts in the big cities? I know in Ohio it's about 50 percent. Is that something similar to national average?

Mr. Pasternack. When you look at adults, young people with disabilities, Mr. Chairman, it's about 40 percent. It varies, because people report dropout data differently. But clearly, too many young people with disabilities are not completing school. When you disaggregate those data, the data are worse for kids of color. So our African-American kids, our American Indian kids, our Hispanic kids, way too many of those kids are being left behind and are not graduating from high school.

We've seen the number of kids, going on to postsecondary school with disabilities rise to an all-time high, so that 10 percent of students enrolled in colleges and universities across the country are kids who report having a disability. It's about one and a half million, the last numbers that we've taken a look at.

If young people with disabilities want to go on to colleges and universities, we ought to be encouraging them to do that, because as you know, kids can't rise to low expectations. We've got to have high expectations for our kids with disabilities.

Mr. Regula. Very well.

Thank you.

OPENING REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY WHITEHURST

Mr. Whitehurst.

Mr. Whitehurst. I'm very pleased to be back with you again. I'll take the same approach I took yesterday and just mention a few things about the budget and then try to illustrate that an investment in research and statistics produces good dividends for the Nation.

RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

The President did ask for a robust increase in the research

and statistics budget for 2003: A 44-percent increase for research and a 12-percent increase for statistics. I hasten to add that the absolute dollar figures are just rounding errors in the budgets of some of my colleagues here, but nevertheless, I'm very pleased that the President has indicated symbolically through these large percentage increases that we need to know what works and we need good statistics as benchmarks to measure our progress.

HIGH SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT

Let me turn to statistics first, as it relates to high school. We need to understand how we're doing compared to our international competitors, and how we're doing internally in this country over time in terms of improving performance among high school students. The TIMSS-R is our major international benchmark for math and science performance. What it shows is that first, we're in the middle of the pack compared to our international competitors.

When you unpack that a little bit, it gets interesting. The correlation between socioeconomic status and performance is much higher in this country than it is among our international competitors. That means knowing that a child is poor in this country tells you much more about what he or she will learn in terms of math and science than it does in many other countries.

When you further unpack the international data, you find the very best of our students are competitive with the very best students in any country in terms of their scores. But we have a wide range of performance. We've found again from looking at TIMSS-R that one of the things that accounts for these differences is that high schoolers in this country simply are exposed to less demanding content in their courses than many high school kids overseas.

When we look at the National Assessment of Educational Progress, we find that only 17 percent of seniors in this country are proficient in math, and only 18 percent are proficient in science. These are really remarkably low figures in terms of----

Mr. Regula. Out of the total class?

Mr. Whitehurst. Out of everybody, the data are from a random sample--representative sample of seniors--across the country. Clearly, with the demands of the 21st century economy and technical jobs, with 17 percent of our high school students graduating proficient in math, we have a significant problem.

Mr. Regula. Have we figured out why?

HIGH SCHOOL COURSEWORK

Mr. Whitehurst. Part of it certainly has to do with course taking. We've seen a fairly healthy increase in the number of children in high school who take rigorous courses in math and science. But it's still less than 50 percent of students who take those courses. So, absent coursework that would produce proficiency, it's not a mystery that we have large numbers of children that are not----

Mr. Regula. Are we counseling these students?

Mr. Whitehurst. Part of it is a matter of counseling. Part

of it also is providing teachers who are trained and able to deliver rigorous coursework.

Mr. Regula. Perhaps enthusiastic, too.

Mr. Whitehurst. Enthusiasm is certainly a part of it. But, we find that in public secondary schools, only 30 percent of the teaching work force has majored in an academic area as an undergraduate in college; that is, has majored in math or majored in science. So again, one of the things we've found from TIMMS-R, as well as other work I'll describe to you briefly, is that many high school teachers, particularly in schools serving children from low income backgrounds, are simply not prepared themselves to offer rigorous coursework.

So at most, many poor children get algebra one or geometry 1 and that's the end of their education in math. If you don't have more than that, it's very difficult to be prepared for college. In fact, students take these courses and pass them, but they don't pass these courses or exit from them with high levels of skill. Math education in this country is largely predicated on a sort of selection model based on assumptions that large numbers of kids just won't get it and we should be satisfied with a small percentage of children who excel. We simply have to do better in math.

HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION RATES

The dropout rates that Carol referred to are computed various ways. But, if you simply look at timely completion--how many kids who were in 9th grade exit from 12th grade four years later--you'll find, particularly among minorities and low-income populations, that it drops to 60 or 65 percent of the population that's actually completing high school on time. So we simply have serious problems there that have to be faced.

RESEARCH ON HIGH SCHOOL REFORM

What are we doing in terms of research? We're two and a half years into a significant investment in the development of comprehensive school reform models that focus on middle school and high school. We've been developing seven of these models. We're not at a point yet to indicate whether or not they are successful or how successful they are compared to each other. But it is a significant investment in trying to put together a system that schools can adopt that will reform high schools and produce higher levels of student performance.

Mr. Regula. These models are funded by grants from your----

Mr. Whitehurst. Yes, they're funded by grants from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Mr. Regula. If they work, you disburse this information to the Nation?

Mr. Whitehurst. That's right. I've spoken previously about our ``what works'' dissemination effort. We will certainly be including evidence on the degree to which these models work in impacting student performance. The model developers tell us uniformly, though, that they encounter a number of problems. One of those problems is that these are models that serve low performing, low-income schools, and very high numbers of kids enter high school without the preparation needed to participate

in rigorous high school courses.

So, each of the model developers has had to develop remedial strategies and doubling up strategies and catch-up strategies to try to get kids to the point where they could take algebra 1. They also have significant literacy problems. We have large numbers of children entering high school who simply have not been taught to read. That has to be addressed.

And, as I mentioned before, the model developers find that significant numbers of teachers are simply not prepared to offer rigorous course work in these schools.

READING COMPREHENSION INITIATIVE

I've mentioned previously one of our new initiatives that I think is very critical to progress in this area, and that's our new initiative in reading comprehension. If we are faced with large numbers of children entering high school or middle school unable to read and understand what they're reading, we need to understand why, we need to understand how to assess that, and we need to develop teaching models that can be successful for these kids. We've asked for \$20 million this coming year to invest in that research program.

We also are very interested in establishing a parallel research program in math education. This work will be particularly focused on algebra, and will examine what students need as prerequisites to be able to understand algebra, and what the teachers need to know to teach it well. We think a long term investment in understanding what's necessary to teach reading comprehension and teach math will pay off the way that our investment in early reading has paid off in new models for elementary school.

Those are the highlights of what we're doing in research. I'm very pleased to be able to talk with you about them and welcome any questions you might have.

[The prepared statement of Assistant Secretary Whitehurst follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. Ms. Neuman.

Opening Remarks of Assistant Secretary Neuman

Ms. Neuman. Mr. Chairman, it's nice to see you again. And it's important to talk about this topic of high school today.

I'll just make a few remarks. So many of my colleagues have talked about some of the key issues that I'll be addressing. As you know, high school students will be required to be more highly skilled than ever before. We know that less than a third of the jobs that high school students will eventually have, that people will eventually have, need more than just a high school diploma.

Russ talked about the importance of not only an educated work force, but the fact that much of our data have not shown tremendous improvement of high school student' skills. The

National Assessment of Educational Progress has shown little improvement over the years. If we begin to disaggregate among different groups, I think we're going to find that the scores and the improvement over the years are even poorer.

What we know, and one of the things we haven't talked about today yet, is that those children who are behind have often started behind in the very early years, in the kindergarten years, where they haven't come to school prepared. That sets them up for failure very early on in their educational career.

No Child Left Behind really begins to redefine the Federal role in K-12 education. We believe in high standards, increased accountability, public reporting of graduation rates, and reduced bureaucracy and greater flexibility with increased options for parental choice. What we are arguing for is strengthened Title I regulations and State accountability, which will be based on challenging content standards and challenging assessments and instruction that is aligned with assessments.

Our new accountability will be unitary instead of creating dual systems, and will be inclusive, so we can begin to look at the kinds of reforms that Bob has suggested for disabled students as well as LEP children.

The Administration is requesting \$11.4 billion, an increase of \$1 billion, for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. States will be able to reserve \$80 million of their Title I allocations to carry out dropout prevention programs or other programs that prepare at-risk youth to complete high school or enter training or employment.

Because No Child Left Behind lowered the poverty threshold for eligibility to operate a Title I schoolwide program from 50 percent to 40 percent, almost 5,000 additional schools, including many high schools, will have additional flexibility in their use of Federal-State funds. But again, this increased flexibility must focus on results. So this Administration keys on flexibility for increased accountability.

As we talked about yesterday, all of our children deserve high-quality teachers. And we know that good teaching should be an entitlement for all of our children. Yet 28 percent of our teachers are often teaching out of their field, some data even suggest that almost 40 percent in low-income schools are teaching out of their field. Therefore, our children are not receiving the high-quality teachers they richly deserve.

So throughout this act, what we are seeing is increased flexibility, increased accountability. What we are promoting is the ability for districts to transfer as much as \$1.8 billion of those funds so that they can be targeted to meet the needs of the local school districts.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Assistant Secretary Newman follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Regula. You mentioned targeted grants, the \$1.8 billion. Are you saying if we were to pass the bill as proposed by the Administration that school districts would have greater flexibility than they now have to use funds in the way they think will produce results?

Ms. Neuman. Exactly. With this flexibility, there comes increased accountability. We have got to begin to look at results, where we use our money more effectively than we have done in the past.

Mr. Regula. How do you do that? How do you measure results?

Ms. Neuman. Well, you know, this is very interesting. As you may know, through our negotiated rulemaking process, one of the things that we recognize is we have not held high school students accountable for learning a body of knowledge. Very often what we've looked at is subject area competence. But also as you know, for those children who, through various means, have not been able to take trigonometry--some children take only algebra--what we have often done is have some of the children take very easy tests at the high school level, or algebra 1, and have other children take trigonometry tests to show subject area proficiency.

One of the things that we did in our reg-neg process is we said that we must begin to hold all of our high school students to high standards, to a body of knowledge that we assume that all of them have to have in order to graduate high school.

Mr. Regula. The question is how to. It's going to really depend a lot on the leadership in the individual schools as to what the superintendent, the principal, the teachers require of students.

Ms. Neuman. I agree.

Mr. Regula. I don't know that we can statutorily mandate that.

Ms. Neuman. Well, one of the things we're beginning to do is use NAEP as a measure to look at whether those States are proficient in terms of national NAEP as well as proficiency in terms of other States. We'll begin to look at the gap between what we know is high-level proficiency and proficiency according to State standards. That will hopefully encourage States to review their standards to ensure high standards for all children.

The other thing, of course, is that with highlyqualified teachers, the teachers will be able to deliver more high-quality materials to our students. That's very much needed.

Mr. Regula. One thing that concerns me greatly is the dropout rate. Because you're talking about the importance of having post-high school opportunities. But when you have a dropout rate as we do in Ohio for the major cities, the inner city type, of 50 percent, you're losing a lot of these kids that will never get to this stage.

Ms. Neuman. Right. I believe that one of the key reasons we are losing many of our students is they are not getting a sense of progress in quality instruction. When our students stay in school and our teachers stay in schools in high-poverty areas, we feel we're making progress. And our accountability mechanisms will allow teachers to see their progress, will allow high school students to see their progress, and we'll begin to intervene more appropriately than we have in the past,

so that we can ensure all children receive the highest-quality instruction.

NEED FOR ``SEAMLESS'' EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Mr. Regula. I was at an Aspen conference in Phoenix on education. The word that I heard repeatedly was ``seamless'', we should make our system seamless. Now it's sort of a benchmark to get through the eighth grade, that's a plateau. Then if you get through high school, it's another plateau--if. And I guess the thrust of what these people who were speaking to us were saying, we have to say to the first grader, you should think in terms of going through college.

Ms. Neuman. Exactly.

Mr. Regula. That it's a progressive, seamless pattern rather than a series of plateaus.

Ms. Neuman. That's right.

Mr. Regula. I've heard that term used, ``seamless,'' this morning. Or at least I think I did. Are you working in that direction? Because this is part of all the things you're talking about.

Ms. D'Amico. Mr. Chairman, that's a big effort on our part, since we have responsibility for high schools, community colleges and to try to ease that transition between high schools and college.

Mr. Regula. Right.

Ms. D'Amico. We're talking to community college people about how do you articulate, what academic expectations do you need in our colleges to be successful, to communicate that to high schools and try to get a seamless system of expectations and assessments. So it's one of the priorities we have as we look toward the reauthorization of our programs.

Mr. Pasternack. One of the problems we face in the world of serving students with disabilities, regarding the word you used, ``seamless,'' is the fact that we have an entitlement to free and appropriate public education under the IDEA. But that changes to an eligibility system under the voc-rehab world.

So parents have difficulty navigating the differences between those two systems. So through the funding that you provide to us through Part D, where we fund parent training and information centers, we're retrying to help educate parents about the differences. Because it really is two very different sets of criteria determining how to get services, what services are available, parents oftentimes have difficulty navigating the differences between those two systems.

That's where having teachers who really understand labor, and understand the one stops and the ticket to work and all these other wonderful Federal programs which are available to help people with disabilities, becomes critically important in our efforts to have this seamless service system.

RELEVANT EDUCATION

And real quickly, Mr. Chairman, you asked about effective models. I see one of my friends from Miami here. In going to Miami, what we saw there is an example, another word that you're going to hear a lot about is ``relevance.'' A lot of

kids are dropping out of school because they don't feel that the education that they're receiving is relevant. You mentioned kids in inner cities particularly.

Models where you can provide entrepreneurship activities, where kids, through starting student based businesses, as an example, see that they have to learn how to read, they have to learn how to write, they have to learn how to speak, work together, and solve problems--all of those skills that are required in order to be able to start a business--that's something that's meaningful and relevant and that kids can relate to.

In Miami, kids with disabilities were actually placed at a hospital where they were doing the transition of students, basically saying, these are skills that you need in order to work in the health care business, and the health care profession needs people. Then, by showing them the relevance of those skills, by actually placing them on the job in a hospital setting, they really understood concretely why it's important for them to stay in school and learn the kinds of skills that the teachers are working so hard to be able to teach them. We're trying to spread the word about the effectiveness of that model to other programs around the country to get it replicated.

FUNDS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTES

Mr. Regula. Well, I have a number of other questions, just one more. I understand that in the vocational education State grants program, the decision of how to distribute Federal funds is left to the State. Most States send the majority of funding to high schools rather than technical institutes. I know that's true in Ohio. And I've urged the State superintendent to take a second look at that. And maybe we ought to break this down, because you've been talking about community colleges at length and technical schools.

Yet our programs seemingly don't reach those to any great extent. Because most State departments of education are geared to the 12 year program. So the natural inclination of that State board of education, and I served on a State board, and we thought in terms of vocational programs in the high school. So the technical institutes are somewhat a new phenomena in our structure for education. But they're not getting much of this money.

What's your response to that, and do you have suggestions as to how we might equalize this? Because I hear you all saying that post-high school is extremely important.

Ms. D'Amico. It is true that under the vocational legislation, the eligible agency technically decides where the money goes. About sixty percent of the money across the country goes to secondary high school programs and about 40 percent goes to postsecondary, mostly community colleges.

Mr. Regula. Sixty-forty.

Ms. D'Amico. Sixty-forty. In 13 States including Guam, 50 percent or more of the money goes to postsecondary.

It's tradition, it's grown up that way. During reauthorization, I would suppose it's a fair question to ask whether that's the appropriate mix, given the nature of our

economy, the demands of the work force. But we are looking for ways within the current law to connect the secondary and the postsecondary programs more closely than they've been connected in the past in many places. So even within the current law, we are trying to encourage models that connect high schools and postsecondary, so that we break down these silos of programs.

Mr. Regula. Do you think we should earmark?

Ms. D'Amico. I think we should talk during the reauthorization about the appropriate balance between the two. [Laughter.]

Mr. Regula. I think that's punting and passing it off.

Ms. D'Amico. I've been in Washington for seven months, so I'm trying----

[Laughter.]

Mr. Regula. Our technical institute runs a sort of a co-op program with the vocational schools, where these students can get some credit in their vocational toward their technical program, to hopefully attract them to think in terms of going on to the technical school and regarding the vocational programs as a foundation or base for the post-high school program. But the way it's structured now, it's obvious that the tilt is in favor of the vocational school in the distribution of funds. It's an historic pattern.

Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ACCOUNTABILITY CHALLENGES

It seems to me if we're going to be pushing all this accountability on the schools and trying to measure the progress of kids, so that we can identify which ones need help and we can have that ``seamless'' system, that we could have a universal identifier for kids in our schools, so that we can do the disaggregation that's necessary to find out whether this Title I program is working or whether we can track minority kids and so forth.

But right now, we don't have that, and it's going to be hard to hold, a lot of the folks in the education system in my State are saying that they're happy to be held accountable, but they want to be held accountable for what they're responsible for. They don't want to be held accountable for something they're not responsible for.

And if you've got this high risk population that's kind of transient and moving from school to school to town to town because their parents are looking for affordable housing, and they're being kicked out of these homes, you can't track these kids. You can't track what's going on for them after school, if they've got social services attached with them, if their family is in distress. No one is talking to anyone else in their system. If you're going to have a seamless approach, you've got to have more transparency. It doesn't seem as if there's enough transparency so that we can measure the information that we're getting in different populations of kids as they're going through the school system.

So maybe you could all take a crack at what we're going to do to help our States put together the software, hardware, whatever it's going to take, for us to measure these kids so that we're not measuring these kids on things that schools

shouldn't be held accountable for. If you're going to penalize these schools for these kids not rising to the level, that's tough stuff, if you're not measuring where they've come from and where they're going. Maybe you could comment on that.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Ms. Neuman. I'll just start, and maybe you would like to add about the full service.

But one of the initiatives in the Education Department is the data management system. I think you raise a very important point, because as this becomes more visible, and the States are required not only to report the numbers of schools that are in school improvement, but also the names of the schools in school improvement, we really need to make sure that the data management is accurate.

Mr. Kennedy. Right.

Ms. Neuman. There are many States that are ready for that. There are others that are lagging behind. One of the initiatives that we have in the Education Department starting this year is a better data management system, which will release burden from many of our States, because it will create a system in which they can input their data and it's visible to all.

Mr. Kennedy. Good.

ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Ms. Neuman. The other thing I would just like to add is, one of the key things that we recognized when we first came into office is the issue of alignment. We cannot demand that our children know something if in fact the assessment and the content standards are not aligned.

The assessments in our schools have to measure the content that is being taught by our teachers. We have a very rigorous set of alignment studies that States are required to pass before their assessment systems are approved. So I think we're moving in the right direction.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Pasternack. I'll quickly just add that for too long, as you know, Mr. Kennedy, too many kids with disabilities have not been included in accountability systems, and have not been included in assessment systems. One of the things that we've been doing with States is help build their capacity to understand the kinds of accommodations that should be offered to students with disabilities in order to include them in State and district mandated tests.

We also, as you know, have a requirement for alternate assessment for that small percentage of students with significant disabilities who can't participate in State and district mandated tests, even with appropriate accommodations. These are the very significantly disabled kids, kids with autism in some instances, kids with significant cognitive disabilities who really require a different approach to assessment.

One of the things that we're really encouraged by and that is so critical to H.R. 1 is this notion of adequate yearly progress. For too long, we haven't expected that kids with disabilities should make adequate yearly progress. We've got to demand that all kids make progress, particularly kids with disabilities.

We're working with States through our Research to Practice division, through the Part D investments that we make. The National Center on Education Outcomes at the University of Minnesota does an outstanding job of helping us disaggregate the data, analyze how States are doing, so that we can then work with States to improve their performance and thereby improve the performance of kids with disabilities.

But you and I both know that what gets measured gets done. If we're not measuring these things, then we're not going to really be able to observe and define and track how well these kids do as a result of receiving the high quality services that they have a right to expect to receive.

TRACKING STUDENT PROGRESS

Mr. Kennedy. If I could follow up on that, how do we actually track a student, particular student A, John Doe in Woonsocket, if his family is moving from Woonsocket to Pawtucket and then to Providence and back up to Woonsocket? How do you, where is our data management that allows us to know that he needs special services or if he's doing well on this, so that we can measure how we're progressing with that student. Not disabled populations in general, and Title I in general or IDEA in general, but specifically that student. That's what I'm looking for.

Mr. Whitehurst. If I could, we have a significant investment, in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, in developing systems that can provide the sort of information on student progress that schools and State systems need. We had a conference here in the Department probably in November, focused on value added assessment and what sort of assessment systems each State would need to be able to track a child as a child moves from grade to grade and from school to school. Many children do move around. Some States have the ability to track them. They assign an identifier to the child.

Mr. Kennedy. That's what I'm talking about. That's exactly what I'm talking about. I think we need an identifier so that we can track individual students through the system. Because we're going to be disaggregating amongst a lot of different groups, disaggregating on different scores, different kids and tracking what works and what doesn't. If you don't have the information, you're nevergoing to be able to track it. To think that we're not helping our States to implement that tracking system with the universal identifier for kids, not only in our education system, but since a lot of these kids come from distressed backgrounds, their families are often in Federal programs and correctional programs and substance abuse and mental health programs.

What are we doing to make sure that we track those kids, in the context of what their family is going through?

Mr. Whitehurst. Just understand that is a State issue. We don't do that at the national level. But, we are doing

everything we can to provide States who want to do this--and many who are not currently are certainly are going to want to do it--with the knowledge and the technology and the design that would let them put such a system in place.

Mr. Kennedy. And the money? [Laughter.]

Mr. Whitehurst. Well, again, we do have a significant investment in all this.

Mr. Kennedy. My State is interested in doing this. I'd like to know from you all where they go to help get not only technical support, because we need to ensure privacy for these kids, but the financial support, so we can set up the infrastructure and so that Rhode Island can be accountable for H.R. 1.

Ms. Neuman. Right. We have about six States that currently have individual identifiers. We're also working on a project for our migrant children, which is one population which is particularly an issue. Because we have to track these individual students. So that is underway.

But as Russ clearly said, it's a State responsibility. We are working with States, and as you know, we have competitive grants for additional monies in assessment to ensure, and that can be one of the things that the State will choose to do. But again, the State must make the decision. We may set the goal. How the State achieves that goal is up to the State. So it might be something that you choose to do.

Mr. Pasternack. I know time is of the essence, but just very quickly, in special education, as you know, there is an individualized education program developed for the kid.

Mr. Kennedy. Right.

Mr. Pasternack. Part of the challenge, getting back to what we talked about yesterday, is that we've got to have the personnel trained to be able to monitor the progress that these kids are making. Because one of the things that you all hear and one of the things that I've heard from too many parents across the country is that they're frustrated by the fact that their children with disabilities are not making the kind of progress that they would like to see their children making.

Part of the reason that's not happening is we don't have teachers trained on how to do progress monitoring, to basically go in every day and measure the impact of instruction, so that you can graph and plot. This requires just paper and pencil, this is not high technology. But it's a matter of having the highly qualified people with the right kinds of skills to be able to deliver those scientifically based instructional strategies, so we can get at the individual progress that kids are making.

Mr. Kennedy. Well, that was my real interest. I'd be interested if all of you can give me more information in that regard. In my State, Peter McWalters is very interested in that. I would just submit some questions for the record, Mr. Chairman, on Even Start and family literacy.

Mr. Kennedy. I know my friend and colleague, Mr. Peterson, is going to delve into vocational education. And I support that effort that he is making, and I am working on that. But I'd like to just have you comment on the adult literacy being a stepchild of voc ed. Voc ed is not high enough, but adult literacy certainly isn't even meeting----

Mr. Regula. Let's reserve that one for the second round.
Mr. Kennedy. Okay.
Mr. Regula. Mr. Peterson.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Peterson. Good morning. I guess I'd like to ask the group first, does the Department of Education evaluate what jobs are not being filled in this country, what jobs are begging? There's a long list of jobs they cannot fill. I meet with employers, and I'm in a devastated economy. But in a good economy in parts of this country, there are long list of people they cannot hire. Do we look at that as a department and do we change our focus?

Ms. D'Amico. Well, certainly in our Office of Vocational and Adult Education, we must be mindful of what the economy looks like, because our role is to prepare young adults and adults for the economy. The Department of Labor has excellent resources as does its Bureau of Labor Statistics, regarding the jobs of the future. Of course, we monitor that quite closely. The resources of the Department of Labor and Bureau of Labor Statistics are excellent. I've used them in my past life as a researcher and as a dean of a community college, and I count on them now.

Mr. Peterson. Every list I look at, the word technology is there. Those are the jobs that we cannot fill. We're not short of masters degrees. We're not short of doctors degrees in this country. We're not short of bachelors degrees. But we're focused on more of them. And I don't understand that. Sure, theoretically, I used to have these arguments with Mr. Riley when he was Secretary, he said everybody should get an academic four year education and then build their life.

Theoretically, I agree with that. But that doesn't work. Poor kids who come from families who don't value education don't even think about an academic education. The ladder for them to climb is not there.

And so we're going to continue to build prisons in this country for poor kids who don't have an education and who don't have skills to fill jobs that are begging. I guess that's the frustration I have year after year. And I'm not blaming you. My anger isn't at you. But year after year, we have flat funded technical education. Two percent of the Federal budget is allocated to technical education. And that's where all the millions of unfilled jobs are.

How do we rationalize that? How do we, at the end of the table, those that need special help, the technical system is where they're dependent. But how does a billion dollars, a billion three, spread not just in high schools, I mean, that's inadequate for high schools, but that's spread between community colleges and high school. That's like spitting in the wind, in my view.

I mean, I think there's a disconnect. There are States that have figured it out. And I have visited some of those. There are States that have figured it out. And they're growing, and they're adding Congressmen. And the States that haven't are losing Congressmen, like my State, who are all academically oriented.

Now, I'm not against academics. I represent some very fine

institutions, Penn State, Bucknell, they're in my district and a lot of other colleges. I shouldn't have named any, because I didn't name them all. But I guess what frightens me is--I'm going to tell you the story of Johnny, who dropped out of school in ninth grade. He has literacy problems. But Johnny worked in a sawmill for a number of years, stacking lumber, one of the few labor jobs left.

He's a good worker, so they now have him running a little calculator, inventorying lumber. I got him in a literacy program, and I said, Johnny, when you get out of that literacy program and you're ready to get your GED, let me know. Do you know what he said to me about my own area? He said, I've got to get some education so I can get out of here. Nobody's going anywhere here. That's where I live. He lives down the street from me. Nobody's going anywhere here.

NEED FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION

We don't have technical classrooms in this country. The number one concern of the health care industry, over and above Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement, which is huge, is being able to employ people. We don't have schools to fill those jobs. Those are pretty simple. All the technicians in a hospital. As a country, we've got to be about providing people, because if we don't, we're going to fill some jobs with increased immigration, and we're going to continue to export all manufacturing and processing to foreign lands. That's where we're headed.

And I just plain see us not getting off the dime. I guess I'm hoping to inspire this Administration, in their No Child Left Behind, build a ladder that any child can get on. And I want to tell you, it's not more academic money. Every high school student should be able to, Microsoft, or what's the other program, Microsoft or Cisco, how many high schools have that? A few. That's where it's at. Eighty some percent of the jobs I read are going to be IT related. Are we ready for that? No, we're not ready for that. We're not even beginning to be ready for that, in my book.

So I've said enough, I guess I'd like to hear from some of you.

Ms. D'Amico. Well, I'd like to respond, because I think we are in agreement about the importance of filling those jobs. In my testimony, I talked about the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which I happen to rely on, that says that 70 percent of the top 30 fastest growing jobs are in IT and health professions. They will require some kind of post-high school training and education, but not necessarily a bachelor's degree. In fact, only about 20 percent of the jobs in the new economy will require the traditional bachelor's degree.

SKILLS FOR THE NEW ECONOMY

So we do have to prepare young people for some kind of training beyond high school to participate in this new economy. But, that doesn't mean the traditional bachelor's degree. What's happening now, Mr. Peterson, unfortunately, is that too many of those young people are coming out of school unprepared

not only for their postsecondary education but also unprepared to participate in any kind of training after high school.

When I talk to technicians, to health care professionals, to the Farm Bureau, to the construction industry I ask what do people need to succeed in your area? I hear very common expectations. They need to know how to read, they need a level of math that they never had before, and they need to be technologically literate. But unfortunately, many of our high school programs are not providing that high level of literacy so that they can participate in this new economy.

We have to increase the rigor of these programs, so that students are prepared for the jobs out there in the new economy.

CHOICE FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. Pasternack. When it comes to students with disabilities, Mr. Peterson, one of the things that we're very concerned about is that they be able to make choices. And that they need to choose from an array of options which are made available to them by implementing the transition requirements that are currently in the IDEA.

One of the things I'd like to point out to you and your colleagues is that the Secretary has two senior advisor positions that he can appoint out of the 5,000 employees in the U.S. Department of Education. One of those, Judge Eric Andell, is advising the Secretary of the Department of Education on juvenile justice, mental health and safe and drug free schools. This Secretary understands the issue that you raised earlier, that if we don't educate kids and they don't get a high school diploma, there's an increased likelihood that they're going to wind up in our juvenile justice system or in our mental health system.

And that's the system failing the kid, that's not the kid failing. So we've absolutely got to do a better job of meeting the needs of all those kids. That's one of the things we're trying to do. But, one of the challenges that we face is making sure that the teachers have the skills to be able to teach the diversity of kids that they find in their classrooms across this country. This shows up in no more problematic area than in the area of kids with disabilities who receive special education.

TRAINING FOR HIGH-SKILL JOBS

Mr. Peterson. Let's assume that half the schools get it. But do they understand where the jobs are? Do guidance counselors know where the jobs are? You have that information. But isn't that information that ought to be down to every guidance counselor and every superintendent of where the jobs are in this country? I find out they have no idea where the jobs are. They're on the same track that the schools have been on for the last three decades, and it's technology, and they don't understand that.

So they're not telling kids to get into IT. How long has IT been here? This is not new stuff. But we're not training people for it. Every company I talk to can't hire top technicians.

They can't hire them. If they have them, people steal them. Departments here can't hire them. They get a good one, somebody hears about it, one of the big companies steals them. When are we going to realize? And 2 percent of our investment going into technical education? That's nothing.

What I find in schools, they tell me they don't build technical classrooms, because it costs more than books. So they're going to teach books as long as they don't have money to build a technical center. Shouldn't we as a Federal focus be helping them develop the classrooms that are necessary for today for the health care workers, for the IT workers and for the manufacturing? If we continue to neglect manufacturing, we're not going to have any.

Manufacturing can compete if they're using the latest technology. I tour manufacturing plants every month in my district. Those that are prospering are using very high skilled technical operations. Low labor, but they're selling in a global marketplace and they hire lots of people. But it's all through IT and robots and a very sophisticated manufacturing process.

But those that aren't doing that and don't understand that, those jobs are going offshore. I want to tell you, I don't think this country gets it. We're going to continue to export our best jobs, we're going to continue to maximize immigration to fill the high tech jobs, because the other countries are teaching high tech better than we are.

SKILLS NECESSARY FOR TECHNICAL JOBS

Mr. Whitehurst. Mr. Peterson, I'm responsible for the research office in the Department. My testimony highlighted our concern with the low levels of math and science performance among our high school students, particularly among students from low income backgrounds who simply are not prepared for the sorts of jobs that you're talking about.

So, part of our budget request for next year would fund a significant investment in research on reading comprehension and math education, focused on providing students the sort of foundation skills that are necessary for the type of technical training that you're talking about.

Kids who cannot do algebra, kids who can't do basic math, children 13, and 14 years old who cannot read and understand what they have read, simply cannot go to one of the classrooms that you're talking about and pick up the skills they need to get a good job. We think it's tremendously important to understand what we need to do to provide kids entering high school with the foundation skills they need to participate in a technical economy. And, then, certainly the issues you raise about the technical education itself are terribly important, as well.

Mr. Peterson. I'd like to make one point. I think some basic technical education in every school helps lower the dropout rate. Because kids do something they become good at, they do something with their hands. Then they begin to learn that they need to read and they need some math if they're going to get the next job. So I think sometimes we don't look at technical education as to hold kids in school.

We have about 25 percent of the population, because of how they're being raised, they're actually growing up almost on the streets. They have a home to sleep in, but they're growing up on the streets and they don't have much guidance. Nobody has taught them the value of education. We think the family is responsible. But there is not a true family in about that many cases.

Now, you give those people something they can do with their hands and they become good at it, and it's like, I suddenly have succeeded at something. Then it turns on the academic side, I think. I think sometimes we put the technical out at the end. It should be at the beginning to give these kids something to do that makes sense, they can relate to. Later on, they'll want an academic education, when they become good at something, when they do something for the first time in their life that they're good at, they're able to compete, they're competitive.

I guess I'm just deeply concerned. If we don't put money there, we aren't going there. We can talk, we can talk and we can talk. Until we put money there into technical education, we're not doing it, we're not going to drive it.

EARLY EMPHASIS ON ACADEMICS

Ms. Neuman. However, I think we're putting money in exactly where we need to put the money, and that's the emphasis on reading first. There's a popular hypothesis that many academics talk about, it's called the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, or the Matthew effect. The Matthew effect assumes a basic, very basic hypothesis, which is, a child who begins behind and stays behind is a first child who's going to drop out, who's a child who cannot read, who is a child who fears failure and so many of these negative consequences come about.

But that child who comes into school that has a strong academic program, who learns how to read, who learns math, begins to feel efficacious and in feeling efficacious enjoys what he or she is doing and therefore wants to learn and wants to learn more, stays in school, gets good jobs, etc.

So I think one of the things that we're saying with the President's budget, and the \$1 billion devoted to Reading First, suggests that we know that when children understand these basics, then the world opens up to them. It's not just one job. For example, in the IT world, we're seeing a decrease in some of the jobs. But those children who can read can then go from job to job in different markets.

So I think one of our purposes is to ensure that children have a strong foundation, so that by the time they get to high school they're very powerful in terms of their learning.

Mr. Peterson. And I agree with you, nothing's more important than reading, nothing. But if they get reading skills and there's no technology programs available for them, they cannot prepare themselves to fill the jobs that are out there. I mean, I don't care how well they read. If they don't have the technical skills, it's more than reading, you have to then have the technical skills. And what I'm saying is, every billion we invest in reading, we ought to invest another billion in technical classrooms. Then we're preparing them for the

opportunities that are out there, to fill the jobs that are begging.

ALIGNING EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Ms. D'Amico. Mr. Peterson, I share your concern that we prepare young people for the jobs that are in demand. I think during the reauthorization, I would very much like to work with you to see how we can construct the law so that we are focusing our resources on jobs that are in demand, jobs of sufficient rigor, jobs that aren't dead end, and that we are actually providing young adults and adults with a real future. I think we've got an opportunity to do that.

Mr. Regula. There's the real challenge.

Mr. Peterson. Yes. Would you furnish me a document that's simple and readable, easily readable, of where the jobs are? Would you give me a document that we can share with our schools? I don't think they get it. I have a few superintendents who get it. Most of them don't get it.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Pasternack. There's also technology available, Mr. Peterson, things like the guidance information system, where through an online model, guidance counselors can help kids find a job. It's got all the jobs in the dictionary of occupational titles, it talks about where training is available, talks about the characteristics of those jobs, so you can do an aptitude and an interest survey with the kid who tells you they don't know what they want to do and help them through this technology that's available to find jobs and training to be able to get those jobs.

I very quickly also want to point out to you that one of the things we've learned that's very interesting is that money is necessary but not sufficient to some of the things that we're talking about here today. One of the reasons why people lose jobs is because they don't have the social skills to be able to keep the jobs once they find the jobs. They don't know how to work as a team, they don't know how to communicate effectively, they don't know how to solve problems, they don't know how to ask for help when they need it, they don't know how to express a complaint.

Those are things that can be taught that don't require large investments of new dollars. They require that teachers understand that those are critically important skills for kids to have. And those things can be delivered in classrooms that are not filled with technology and filled with equipment. It's just a matter of approaching it differently, understanding the importance of teaching kids those skills.

Mr. Peterson. I think normally we depended on the family for that. But we have to realize that 25 percent of the kids have families that aren't teaching them that. Somebody is going to have to teach them that. Those are basically skills my parents taught me.

Mr. Regula. We're going to have a vote soon. I want to give

Mr. Jackson an opportunity before we have to go to vote.

Mr. Jackson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT FOR GEARUP

I want to start by thanking all of the assistant secretaries from the Department of Education for being here today and for their testimony. I have two questions of Secretary Stroup and one of Secretary Whitehurst.

Secretary Stroup, in the last Congress, the House approved a package of technical amendments to the Higher Education Act that would have extended from five years to six years GEAR-UP grants to both States and partnerships. This technical correction would ensure that GEAR-UP grants are of sufficient duration to provide college awareness and early intervention services to an entire cohort of low income students from the 7th grade through roughly the 12th grade.

I'm wondering, first, do you support this change, and do you think it will be necessary to make this technical correction prior to the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act? I hope you will discuss with us relevant time considerations and any potential program funding implications.

Ms. Stroup. Congressman Jackson, I don't know that I can answer that in detail, but I can certainly get back to you on it.

I think, we actually don't even need to do it, because I think we've made some adjustments already to make sure that we're covering the cohorts of students that are coming through. But I will have to go back and verify that and make sure that it's working the way I think it is. I know the technical amendment you're speaking of. I think it is a moot issue at this time. The House bill included it. But I have to go back and find out for you.

Mr. Jackson. I wish you'd get back to me on that.

[The information follows:]

Technical Amendments to the Higher Education Act

The Department has not submitted a package of technical amendments to the Higher Education Act since the current Administration took office. We are providing drafting assistance to the authorizing committee on a package of technical amendments based on Congressman McKeon's Fed Up initiative. As part of that initiative, the House Education and the Workforce Committee solicited comments on the Higher Education Act and its implementing regulations. The committee did not receive any comments on the issue you raised. From the Department's prospective, we felt that this change could wait until the Higher Education Act is reauthorized next year. We will, however, take a look at this issue again to determine if this issue should be addressed sooner.

FY 2003 BUDGET FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Jackson. Also, Assistant Secretary, in a recent poll, 88 percent of the American public agreed that Federal spending on higher education must be increased, so that students from

low income communities may have equal access to the opportunities that education provides. It is my belief that that includes providing additional resources for TRIO. Yet, the Department has chosen to level fund this program, the Pell Grant maximum award, and most other higher education programs.

I'm wondering how you plan to help low income high school students prepare for and complete a postsecondary education so that they may have equal access to the opportunities that education provides when you've level funded programs like TRIO, SEOG and the maximum Pell Grant award.

Ms. Stroup. Let me start with Pell Grants. You're right, the budget proposal keeps the Pell Grant maximum at \$4,000, but at the same time about 55,000 more kids are actually going to get a Pell Grant come next year. So we're expanding the pool of students while keeping the maximum award at the \$4,000.

If somebody finds extra money, to cover the shortfall problem we have we can have a different conversation. Somewhere along the way, we have to find enough money to fund the \$4,000. That is my first concern, because the \$1.3 billion shortfall needs to be covered, or we're going to run out of money at some point in time in making the Pell Grant awards.

TRIO AND GEARUP

On TRIO and GEARUP, you're right, we've level funded both of those. The Administration strongly supports those programs. I think the issue we have right now is, those two programs have been in a competitive mode. We've heard some people say negative things about both programs. We're hoping that people get away from that. We support both programs. What we're trying to do now, though, is do a real evaluation of both programs. GEARUP is too new. We don't have any real data yet. We have baseline, but not what's happening data.

We had a report come out on one of the TRIO programs that said it was, in fact, ineffective. Part of it maybe was ineffective, but another part of it was effective. It's a matter of figuring out which of these parts really work and target the money to those things. Because what we don't want to do is waste the money. So that's really the first priority we started with.

So we want to look at those evaluations that are going to come out soon and figure out what we need to do to actually target the money where it should go, to serve the most students we can, and make those proposals part of the higher education reauthorization which is coming up. Once we have done that, we can look at which programs should get more money. Because again, right now, they're in a competitive mode, and that causes us problems, I think, on the funding side.

Mr. Jackson. I appreciate your answer. I have one other question of Secretary Whitehurst. I don't know what your experience is with the TRIO program before becoming Assistant Secretary or the SEOG or the Pell Grant program. Would you like to share with the Committee what your personal experiences were with these programs before becoming Assistant Secretary?

Ms. Stroup. My personal experience is that I helped write most of the amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1998. So I'm really familiar with the programs. I haven't actually

gotten any of those benefits. I only had student loans in my background. I had to borrow student loans to go to school. I didn't qualify for a Pell Grant.

But I'm familiar with those programs, I've seen them in operation. I've been to the schools, and colleges that operate the programs. So personally, I'm a huge fan of the Pell Grant.

Mr. Jackson. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

HBCU FUNDING

Secretary Whitehurst, the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement supports research, data collection, and analysis activities in the assessment of student progress. With so much focus on improving the achievement of disadvantaged and minority students, one would logically seek to collaborate with those educators and researchers with proven track records in the education that this population of students concerns.

I can think of no better partner for the Federal Government to work with in this area, than our Nation's historically black colleges and universities. Can you tell me how much of your agency's funding goes to HBCUs for research, data collection and analysis activities and the assessment of student progress?

Mr. Whitehurst. I can't give you that precise figure. I'd be glad to get back to you on that. One of our principal centers, CRESPAR, is colocated at Johns Hopkins and at Howard University here in Washington, D.C. I'm not sure what proportion of our other grant money goes to historically black colleges, but I can certainly check and let you know.

[The information follows:]

HBCU Research Funding

In fiscal year 2001, Howard University, a partner with Johns Hopkins University in the Center of Research on Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) grant, received \$2.31 million for its research activities. No other research, data collection and analysis, or assessment funding under the Office of Educational Research and Improvement went to historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

Mr. Jackson. Other than the center you mentioned at Howard in partnership with Johns Hopkins, are you aware of any other centers that exist on the campuses of any other HBCUs?

Mr. Whitehurst. No, we have no other center on the campus of an historically black college or university.

Mr. Jackson. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions that I want to submit for the record, in light of our vote. I would really appreciate it if the questions that I do submit for the record, promptly receive written responses. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. Can you respond to questions in two weeks? And we'll see that you get a copy as soon as they get back.

Mr. Jackson. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Regula. We've got a couple of minutes, if there's anything else you really want to get at.

Mr. Jackson. No, nothing that I could cover in a couple of

minutes, sir.

Mr. Regula. Well, we'll get your questions submitted.

We have a vote on. I have some more questions, if the panel, can you wait? Are any of you on a tight time schedule?

Okay. We have probably two votes. Do you have anything you want to still get in?

WORKFORCE SUPPLY VERSUS DEMAND

Mr. Peterson. I think I caused enough damage. I am passionate about the issue. I'd love to sit down with any one of you that are interested. I think we have to crank it up. I don't think the country realizes what's happening. That's my view. I interview employers every month that can't hire the people, in an area with high unemployment, cannot hire the people they need, they're not there.

I don't know of anybody's son that says they want to be a mechanic or a plumber or an electrician. They're begging for them. They're good jobs. This country is in a disconnect. I don't know where we're going, but I want to tell you, we're not going to have anybody to fix anything, build anything. I'm told, on the sea coast, we're already using mostly immigrants to construct. That's outrageous, that our kids go without jobs, sit in prisons because they have no usable skills. We're bringing in immigrants to do the work that's good paying jobs. Everybody can't run the company.

Ms. D'Amico. I find your passion encouraging. I will look forward to working with you on the reauthorization of vocational education so that we can make sure these programs are directed toward building the economy and the work force.

Mr. Peterson. I'd be glad to go to Mitch Daniels with you and get some money in the pot, too, if you'll join me there.
[Laughter.]

Mr. Peterson. But we won't do it without money.

Mr. Regula. Take a minute on your Georgia experience, Mr. Peterson.

STATE TECHNICAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Mr. Peterson. I just went down to Georgia and looked at their technical program. I came home sick in comparing it to my State. They're growing, it's why some of these States are growing. They have 34 technical colleges. They have 17 branches and 4 other schools that have technical divisions. Then they have a program called Quick Start that builds on that, and any company that will grow or expand in Georgia gets their people trained through these schools free. The cost of this technical education is \$30 a credit. My State could never do that.

And they think it's cheaper than it should be. But you lose your job in Georgia and in North Carolina and some other States, you go to technical school almost free, get some skills and prepare yourself for the work force. Those States are going to eat our lunch, the rest of the country. But we need the whole country doing that, because if we don't, we're going to export the jobs, we're going to bring in immigrants to fill the technical jobs as we are in IT. This is what's happening in this country. I don't think people realize what's really

happening.

I talk to employers every month. In the areas where there's economic growth, the shortage is even greater. It's in my area where we have high unemployment. We've got to change our focus, in my view. But States like, Georgia is number one at skill. They're rated number one by the relocation magazine. North Carolina was second, and I was surprised, Michigan was third. But of the top 15 States, it's basically, I could give them all to you, but it was the Carolinas, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Wisconsin, Michigan, South Dakota and Illinois. Nobody in the northeast, nobody in the west.

But most of those States are growing.

Mr. Regula. Point's well made. We'll recess for 10 minutes or 15 until we get the vote.

[Recess.]

Mr. Regula. Well, I'm sorry to hold you up. But we had three votes, and that's the way it goes.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

It's interesting, this week's Newsweek, you probably have seen it, there is an article about companies of the future, using technology to get ahead in business. The office of tomorrow, and I didn't get a chance to read the story. But glitzy tech firms in Silicon Valley tend to get all the attention. But away from that spotlight, all sorts of companies, from a winery in Oregon to a car seat maker in Detroit, to a startup airline in New York, are using technology to push ahead in business, transform industries and change their lives.

How appropriate to what we've been talking about today. And I think it's so true, we just had a company announce yesterday in my district that makes car seats that they're closing. So we have 450 people who will be looking for jobs and probably a lot of them will end up at the technical institute, since it's an avenue for them to break out from the situation they're in. I don't think we've probably focused enough at the national level on technical education.

You heard Mr. Peterson talk about Georgia, which has 34 technical institutes. Ohio doesn't begin to have that many. We have a good one in my district, but it's one of a few. What I'm impressed with is the numbers of enrollment. It started about 25 years ago, it's up to 5,000, the placement rate is phenomenal. Because it's where the jobs are. And the beauty of it is that companies come to them and say, we need these kinds of employees, so they put in a technology to respond to the community needs.

We have a lot of volunteer fire companies and they want to train their volunteers, as well as those that are paid, so they put in a tower and they train firemen. I could give you a whole host of examples. I think it's part of the future, and we need to take a better look at it at the Federal level. Because our role is to stimulate, our role is not to run these schools nor to be the foundation of the schools. Our role is to be seed corn, in some instances, to be incentivizers--I don't know if that's a word or not--but to encourage schools to be

responsive. I think this is an area where we need to do work.

I was interested, Mr. Pasternack, in your comments that more and more of the disabled are finding that they can go on in education and find a niche. That's terrific. We all want to be useful. We all want to feel that we have a role to play in society. If we can help in the education system, to help to give people that opportunity, we've done what we should be doing, to give people a chance, give them hope, give them an opportunity to be useful.

I think the adult education, vocational-technical, does offer this kind of an opportunity. I'll be interested in reading your article, but I think probably the thrust of it is, probably that we're entering an age of technical development. We would be interested in suggestions from your departments on what we can do using the funds. I sort of think that policy follows money. I know you were on the authorizing committee and you can authorize but----

Ms. Stroup. You've got to fund it.

FULL FUNDING

Mr. Regula. You've got to fund it. In fact, H.R. 1 creates a little bit of a challenge for us, because the authorizing levels are somewhat higher than the amount of money that we have. It creates a bit of a disconnect. People say, why aren't you full funding? That's the magic word, full funding. We get into that with IDEA. Probably reaching 40 percent in one year is unrealistic. But on the other hand, we should be doing more, and we are, the president has requested a billion dollars more in IDEA this year.

But people don't fully understand that these are two different functions, one to authorize and one to appropriate. And policy does ultimately follow the money.

But I'd be interested, and I know you're on the team and therefore you support the Administration's budget as is. But we don't have to do that. And if you want to send me a couple of suggestions over the transom, I'll be interested. I just want to make the thing work. I just want to make the money we spend, and there's lots of it, serve the people out there in the best possible way. We can submit most of our questions for the record.

DROPOUTS

One of the things that really concerns me is dropout rate. I might have mentioned this before, but the Gates Foundation and Ford and Knowledge Works are going to spend \$35 million in Ohio. It will be, I think, the second State in which they do this, they announced it in my district. It will go to the State department and they in turn can fund applications for grants from the high schools that have the problems, to try to find ways to address the dropout rate. I went to a high school, a vocational school, and talked to these kids. I was dismayed by the sense of despair. These are a lot of minority kids, they said, well, we don't have a chance, I said, have you thought about going to the technical school, well, what's that. You talk about seamless, they should know about that.

I've said to the technical president, you should be putting some courses in that school so that they get a taste of what you can do. Maybe we can develop some Federal incentives to do things like that. We've got to grab these kids before it's too late.

I guess so much for my little sermon this morning. There are opportunities out there. I see Ms. Neuman is gone. Do any of you have any suggestions on how we can deal with the dropout rates? It's a terrible waste of human capital, 50 percent in Ohio.

Ms. D'Amico. I think Susan was right about one thing, unfortunately some of these young people are making very rational decisions when they drop out, because they are so hopelessly behind in reading and math. I sincerely believe that once No Child Left Behind kicks in, that will help a lot. Because these kids won't be continuously passed through, get to the 10th grade and realize they cannot do the work, and the chances of their doing the work are pretty slim.

If you've got a 9th grader who cannot read to the 9th grade level, it might take three or four years to bring that 9th grader up to that level. We just have to stop that. That's why the focus on reading, I believe, is so important.

Mr. Regula. I agree with you completely. It's got to be frustrating to young people, somebody like myself sitting in a class that's being conducted in Spanish. You'd sit and lose interest. I used to tell groups of teachers, I spent seven years in public education, and when I'd speak to them, I'd say the lower the grade, the more they should get paid. Because that's where the kids are influenced. They have to learn their reading, their attitudes toward education are shaped by those early experiences with the teacher. You're right, we're often too late.

Now, will these programs that we're putting in place get us over those barriers? I don't know. I hope so.

Ms. D'Amico. They've got to.

Mr. Regula. The military used to take these kids. I remember when I was practicing law, the juvenile judge would say, well, okay, if you'll go to the Army, we'll suspend your sentence or whatever it might be. Well, the Army won't take them now. So suddenly, who's going to deal with this problem? Not the military any more. Therefore, we have an additional responsibility in public education to somehow----

Mr. Pasternack. And as you know, Mr. Chairman, if you don't have a high school diploma, you can't get in. That is something that we are very concerned about. I think one of the things that we are asking for is continued support for our research agenda. Because we've got to help people identify, in a very rigorous way, what works.

The hearings that you've held, these are issues that start in early childhood and persist. It's about having highly qualified people with the right kinds of skills to be able to accommodate the diversity of kids that are in these classrooms. We know that these issues disproportionately affect kids of color. And we're very concerned about that.

What you see in a lot of these schools that are in inner cities, as you were talking about in your district, for example, oftentimes you have the least qualified teachers, the youngest teachers, the least skilled teachers, teaching in those kinds of settings. As we told you during one of the earlier hearings, when we talked about personnel preparation, we had 12,000 openings. So we have a critical shortage of finding the right kinds of people to get into these classrooms.

Mr. Regula. Some of our cities are going overseas to recruit. Because they have a very difficult time finding people that are willing to teach in the inner city. The teacher in this class that I mentioned, at a vocational school, she came here, was recruited to teach in the classroom she was in, in that school. Vocational rehabilitation, do you deal with that?

Mr. Pasternack. Yes, sir, I do.

UNDER EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISABLED

Mr. Regula. Is there pressure to close cases and sometimes get individuals in the low skilled jobs, just sort of like the judge, send to them to the military?

Mr. Pasternack. Mr. Chairman, you ask an excellent question. There is a perception that there may be pressure to close cases. I think what you hear in terms of this order of selection, where we're asking States to serve those individuals with the most significant disabilities first, is that these are people who don't need short term services. These are people who need long term services and intensive services.

One of the reasons why we're proud to support the Administration's request for additional funding, the \$2.6 billion that we're asking for under Title I of the VR program, is that in recognition of the fact that we've got to do a better job in terms of focusing more on results and better outcomes. I spoke earlier about the President's new freedom initiative, where he reported in his first month in office a 70 percent unemployment rate for adults with disabilities. What's worse is that there's a 90 percent under-employment rate.

So even in instances where we find jobs for individuals with disabilities, in many instances they're not working at jobs they're really capable of holding. The point you made earlier, if a plant in your community closes and you have 450 people who don't have disabilities who are looking for work, it makes it that much harder to find people who are willing to provide meaningful work for adults with disabilities.

We have a performance goals and indicators project that we're working on with the voc rehab system where we really are trying to establish at each State a data driven management so that we can see how they're doing with the case closures and get a better handle on the important question that you raise. Some of these adults really need a significant set of resources and supports in order to be able to find habilitation and training.

The rehab model is interesting, because rehabilitation assumes that somebody had skills and then lost those skills. In many instances with the younger people that we've been talking about, they never had the skills in the first place. So for them, it's not about rehabilitation, it's about habilitation.

It's an interesting semantic change but it really does talk about the difference in emphasis in those two groups of individuals.

We're also seeing issues in traumatic brain injury with an increase in the numbers of adults who wind up needing voc rehab services because of having a traumatic brain injury. We saw a significant increase in demand, for example, in New York after the tragedy of 9/11, and worked with their State system to provide some additional resources to help them.

These are people who in many instances, especially those with significant disabilities, need technology. It's not about needing a job in the technology sector, it's about needing assistive technology in order to be able to communicate, in order to be able to live independently. We've got significant problems with them having access to transportation. We've got significant problems with them having access to home ownership. Less than 10 percent of adults with disabilities in this country own their own homes.

If they can't get jobs and they can't establish a credit rating, how do we go to banks and work with banks and say, why don't you lend these people money so that they can live in their own homes, for those individuals who want to live on their own. As you said, we ought to be encouraging people to participate fully in the American dream, and we ought to be able to set high standards for those people and help them meet those standards and have high expectations.

Again, just to drive home the message in my mind and I know in yours, disability does not mean inability. We've got to just keep working with the public sector and the private sector to increase the employment rates for adults with disabilities.

Mr. Regula. I have visited some of these facilities. Self-respect, a feeling of self-worth, whatever your situation, is extremely important. I think probably our challenge is to try to give every individual a situation where they can feel a certain sense of self-worth. We're all people.

CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING REMARKS

Well, I'm sorry to hold you up today. You're important people. There's a lot of folks all across this country depending on you for a lot of reasons we've discussed this morning. We want to use our resources here in the best possible way. I'd be happy to meet with you one on one, if we have an opportunity, just to see how we can best do this. I know the President wants to accomplish these same goals. He really feels that we should Leave No Child Behind. That's an enormous, enormous challenge. You've all been in education, so you know, to meet that kind of a challenge is a huge task. Nevertheless, we should do the best we can to meet it.

Well, thanks again for coming. The subcommittee is adjourned.

[The following questions were submitted to be answered for the record:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

W I T N E S S E S

	Page
Carroll, T.G.....	435
D'Amico, Carol.....	463
Ferrier, M. H.....	323
Finch, Lew.....	435
Hansen, William.....	1
Hickok, E. W.....	123
Horn, W. F.....	203
Johnson, L. J.....	435
Neuman, S. B.....	123, 203, 323, 463
Paige, Rod.....	1
Pasternack, R. H.....	203, 323, 463
Reeder, Aubrilyn.....	435
Skelly, T. P.....	1, 323, 463
Stroup, Sally.....	323, 463
Whitehurst, G. J.....	203, 323, 463

I N D E X

Secretary of Education

	Page
2003 Budget (also see individual programs)	
2003 Budget.....	2-9, 14, 24, 40, 45, 51, 58-59, 66, 70, 73, 80-81, 85-86, 96-98, 105-110, 112
21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	7, 112, 115
A Nation At Risk Report.....	38
Academic Achievement (see Student Achievement)	
Accountability.....	19, 57, 64, 66, 68, 69, 101, 103-05, 114, 120
Administration for Children and Families (ACF).....	95
Adult Education.....	47, 49-51, 65
Advanced Placement Program.....	87
America's Schools Conferences.....	89
Annual Performance Plan.....	67
Bilingual Education.....	25, 69, 75, 76, 114
Block Grant Programs.....	101
Budget and Test Development Costs.....	24, 83, 115, 126
Budget Response to Events of September 11, 2001.....	40, 116
California's New Teach Project.....	55
Career Academies.....	90
Census Data.....	17
Center for the Study of Learning, George Washington University...	97
Centers For International Business Education (CIBE).....	85
Chairman Regula Opening Remarks.....	1
Charter Schools.....	26, 29, 98-100, 103
Civics Education.....	45, 81, 82, 83, 111
Class Size Reduction Program (see also School Size).....	78-80, 87-89, 98, 99, 111, 117, 119

Collective Bargaining Agreement.....	70, 71
College Graduation Rates.....	59, 74, 78, 121
Colleges of Education.....	44, 56-58
Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process.....	63, 64
Corporation for National and Community Service.....	117
Cost of Meeting New Teacher Qualification Requirements.....	77, 81
Cost to Implement No Child Left Behind Act.....	15, 16, 45
Curriculum.....	56, 81, 82, 85, 93, 95, 121
Curriculum (see also Reading, Math, Science, Foreign Language/ Area Studies, Testing)	
Department Financial Audit.....	67, 68, 106
Departmental Management.....	9, 26, 27, 32, 59, 67, 68, 71, 84, 100, 104-06, 114
Discretionary Funds.....	28, 73, 107-09, 113, 115
Dissemination (see also Research).....	61, 84, 85, 97, 99, 100, 114, 120
Dropout Prevention and Rates.....	72, 87, 88, 91, 93, 94, 111
Early Childhood Education/Development.....	35-37, 69, 95, 103
Early Reading First (see also Reading Initiatives).....	64, 98, 99
EDCAPS Financial Management System.....	105
Education Statistics.....	65, 75, 94, 97
Educational Technology State Grants....	79-81, 87, 88, 98, 99, 110, 111, 119
Eisenhower Professional Development Program.....	77, 78, 87, 112
Elementary & Secondary Education Act (see also Title I).....	58, 72, 76, 113-117, 120, 121
Emergency Response Plans.....	114, 124
Emotional and Social Development of Children.....	37
English Language Acquisition Program.....	69, 98, 99, 113
Enrollment in Postsecondary Education.....	58, 59, 72, 116
ESEA (see Elementary and Secondary Education Act)	
Evaluation.....	57, 62, 65, 66, 75, 82, 85, 90-95, 97-102, 113, 115, 118, 121
Even Start.....	37, 49-51, 98, 100, 110
Family Literacy.....	50, 95
Federal Expenditures.....	2-9, 11-16, 28, 36, 41, 59, 62, 63, 69, 72, 76, 84, 94, 95, 116, 117
Federal Role versus Local Responsibility.....	2, 42
Financial Management Systems.....	67, 68, 105
Flexibility.....	7, 53, 56, 69, 76-79, 81, 87, 88, 114, 117-19, 122
Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) (see International Education Programs)	
Fulbright-Hays Centers and Programs.....	85
Full Service Schools--Judy Centers.....	39
Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE).....	81, 96, 98, 102, 110
Gaining Early Awareness & Readiness For Undergraduate Programs (Gear Up).....	121
Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN).....	85, 86, 92
Head Start Program--Departmental Administration.....	30, 31
High School Initiatives.....	86, 93, 101
High School Size: Effects on Budgets and Performance in New York City.....	97, 100
Higher Education Act (HEA) Reauthorization.....	78
Highly Qualified Teachers (see also Teacher Quality/Training)....	53-56, 75-78, 81, 117
Highly Qualified Teachers (see also Title I, ESEA, Section 1119)	
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).....	34, 35
Historically Black Graduate Institutions (HBGIs).....	34, 35

IDEA, Part B State Grants (see also Individ. w/Disabilities Education Act).....	76, 117, 119
Improving Colleges and Education.....	56-58
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (see Teacher Quality State Grants)	
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).....	5, 63, 64, 76, 96, 116, 117, 119, 120
Innovative Education State Grants.....	98, 99, 101
Inspector General.....	67, 105, 106
Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs.....	106, 107
International Comparisons of Achievement.....	18, 29
International Education Programs.....	46, 83-86, 111
Jackson State University Cooperative Agreement.....	49, 104
Language Resource Centers (LRCs).....	84, 85
Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students.....	69, 113, 114
Loan Forgiveness Program.....	29, 53, 54, 118
Mandatory Spending.....	28, 63, 79, 96
Math..	6, 11, 12, 54, 61, 62, 72, 75-7, 82, 83, 92-94, 97, 112, 117, 121
Maximum Funds Allowable for National Activities, for certain Program Statutes.....	99
Model Teacher Mentoring Programs.....	53-55, 57
Monitoring.....	54, 58, 59, 63, 64, 73
National Activities Funding.....	90, 98, 99
National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB).....	82, 83
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).....	12, 13, 82, 83
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.....	39
National Center for Education Statistics.....	75, 94
National Center on Educational Outcomes, University of Minnesota.	120
National Clearinghouse on Comprehensive School Reform.....	89, 97
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD).	95
National Institute of Mental Health.....	95
National Resource Centers (NRC).....	84, 85
National Science Foundation (NSF).....	62, 72, 75, 85, 86, 117
No Child Left Behind Act.....	1-2, 4-9, 14-16, 66-69, 71, 77-83, 87, 96, 101, 105-7, 116-18
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI).....	60-62, 94-95, 118
Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs.....	106-07
Oracle Federal Financials System (see also Department Financial Audit).....	67-68
Paraprofessional Teachers.....	48, 77, 101
Parental Involvement.....	6, 71, 111, 114, 115
Pell Grant Program.....	30, 33, 58, 59, 72-74, 121
Performance-Based Data Management Initiative.....	67, 105
Physical Education and Obesity Rate for Children.....	31, 32
Postsecondary Education.....	8, 59, 72-74, 121
President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education.....	38, 96
President's Management Agenda.....	84, 105
Professional Development.....	41, 43, 58, 64, 68, 69, 76, 78-81, 103, 117, 120
Program Administration (see also Departmental Management).....	105-07, 115, 116
Reading Initiatives.....	61-65, 71, 76, 83, 93, 94, 98-100, 103, 104, 113, 121
Reductions and Terminations Proposed in the FY 2003 Budget.....	109-112
Rehabilitative Services.....	65, 110
Requirement Waivers and Compliance Agreements.....	87, 122

Research.....53-56, 60-66, 75, 76, 79-81, 84, 87, 88, 90-101,
 112, 113, 115, 118, 120
 Safe and Drug-Free Schools.....23, 79-81, 87, 88, 98-102, 110, 114, 119
 Salaries and Benefits (see Program Administration)
 School Choice..... 100
 School Construction..... 47
 School Leadership.....41, 80, 85, 118, 129
 School Reform.....81, 87, 89, 93, 94, 96-98
 School Size.....87-93, 98, 99, 111
 Science.....11, 12, 54, 56-58, 61, 72, 75, 76, 77, 82, 94, 97, 112, 117
 Secretary Roderick R. Paige: Statement and Biographical Sketch..1, 4-10
 Senior Executive Service (SES) Positions..... 107
 Smaller Learning Communities Program.....88-90, 93, 98, 99, 111
 Special Education Teachers.....54, 75, 120
 Special Education.....33, 37, 38, 42, 54, 63-65, 74-76, 93, 95, 96,
 116, 119, 120
 State and Local Transferability Authority.....79, 80, 87, 88
 State Grants for Innovative Programs.....53, 80, 81, 87, 88, 119
 State Standards and Assessments.....46, 114, 115, 120
 States Expenditures.....14, 63
 Strategic Plan..... 60, 74, 83, 84, 94, 101, 102
 Student Achievement..... 53, 55, 66-72, 76, 79, 81, 86, 90-95,
 100, 102-05, 112, 114, 116-18
 Student Financial Aid (see also Pell Grant Program)... 65, 67, 74, 105,
 106
 Studies on School Size (see also Class Size Reduction Program)...90-93,
 98, 99, 100
 Targeted Grants..... 3, 68, 87
 Tax Credits..... 21
 Teach for America..... 53, 117
 Teacher and Professional Development..... 53-58, 76-82, 84, 86
 Teacher Pay..... 42-44, 79
 Teacher Quality Enhancement Program..... 53, 57, 188
 Teacher Quality State Grants..... 40, 53, 56, 58, 69, 70, 76, 77-81,
 87, 98, 99, 117-19
 Teacher Quality/Training..... 20, 21, 39-41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 53, 57,
 76-78, 101, 102, 116-18
 Teacher Shortages/Recruitment (see also Colleges of Education)..... 54,
 74, 75, 117, 118
 Teachers for Non-English Speakers..... 43
 Technology (see Ed. Tech. St. Grants..... 23, 24, 69, 71, 75, 80,
 101, 102, 105, 110-12, 119
 Tennessee Project Star..... 79
 Testing..... 15, 19, 20, 24, 54, 71, 82-84, 87, 89, 92, 103, 104, 115,
 120-22
 Title I, ESEA Section 1119 Requirements (see also ``Highly
 Qualified'' Teachers)..... 77, 78
 Title I, ESEA.....17, 18, 22, 23, 33, 34, 65-69, 71-72, 76-78, 87-88,
 96, 99-101, 116, 117, 121
 Transition to Teaching..... 53-56, 118
 Travel Budget..... 89, 105, 106
 TRIO Programs..... 34, 35, 99-101, 121
 Troops-To-Teachers..... 53, 54, 118
 Union Activities..... 70, 71
 Unsolicited Grants Funded in FY 2001..... 102-04
 Upward Bound..... 99-101
 Vocational Education..... 65

Vocational Rehabilitation.....	7, 65
Waivers and Compliance Agreements (see also Title I, ESEA).....	122
We the People Curriculum (see also Civics Education).....	82
What Works Clearinghouse.....	56, 60, 61, 97, 118
White House Summit on Early Childhood Cognitive Development.....	95

Implementation of No Child Left Behind

2003 Budget Request.....	149, 150, 153
21st Century Community Learning Centers:	
21st Century Community Learning Centers Accountability.....	193
21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	189
Continuation of Centers.....	191
Evaluation of 21st Century Community Learning Centers.....	190
Guidance on 21st Century Program.....	191
Accountability.....	144
Adequate Yearly Progress	
Adequate Yearly Progress.....	176, 184
Comparison of AYP in 1994 and 2002 Laws.....	180
Guidance on Adequate Yearly Progress.....	181
States and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).....	180
Assessment:	
Alignment Assessments.....	154
Assessment of At-Risk and Highly Mobile Students.....	172
Assessment of Limited English Proficient Students.....	173
Assessment Requirements.....	164
Cost of New Assessment Requirements.....	165
Different Assessment Systems.....	154
``Dumbing Down'' Assessments.....	171
Flexibility for State Assessments.....	171
Further Waivers of 1994 Assessment Requirements.....	170
State Compliance with Assessment Requirements.....	167
Status of State Compliance with 1994 ESEA Assessment Requirements.....	169
Biographical Sketch of Under Secretary Hickok.....	131
Budget Request and Professional Development.....	152
Challenges in Education.....	143, 157
Charter Schools:	
Charter Schools.....	144
Research on Charter Schools.....	199
Colleges of Education.....	145
Coordinator Program.....	195
Costs:	
Costs of Disaggregating Data.....	170
Costs of Full Compliance with 1994 ESEA.....	170
Costs of Improving Failing Schools.....	181
Dropout Rates and Test Scores.....	172
Education Inputs Vs. Outcomes.....	155
Faith-Based Organizations and Community Learning Centers.....	192
Federal Investment in Education.....	139
Funding for Choice and Supplemental Services.....	184
Funds for New Teacher Requirements.....	201
Growth in Number of LEP Students.....	173
Implementation:	
Implementation Challenges.....	163
Implementation Process.....	161
Introduction of Witnesses.....	123

Investment:	
Investment in Education.....	134, 149
Investment in No Child Left Behind.....	135, 148
Investment in Teacher Quality.....	137
Kentucky's Testing System.....	134
Mathematics and Science Partnerships.....	197
Mentoring Programs.....	197
No Child Left Behind:	
Final Regulations.....	161
No Child Left Behind Act.....	132
No Child Left Behind Implementation.....	158
Program Evaluation.....	166
Request to the Secretary for No Child Left Behind Programs...	153
Results of NCLB Act Reforms.....	167
Non-Discrimination Requirements.....	182, 193
Opening Statement.....	124
Professional Certification of Teachers.....	157
Reading:	
Reading Debate.....	142
Reading First.....	141, 142
Research-Based Reading Programs.....	163
Safe and Drug-Free Schools:	
Emergency Response Plans.....	196
Project SERV Funding.....	196
Safe and Drug-Free Schools.....	195
Safe School/Healthy Students Initiative.....	194
School Counselors Program.....	199
School Improvement Fund.....	179
School Leadership.....	145
School Renovation.....	193
School Safety.....	200
Spending Vs. Results.....	156
State Accountability:	
State Accountability.....	132
State and Local Accountability.....	151
State and Local Investment in Teachers.....	138
State and Local Report Cards.....	187
State Participation in NAEP.....	175
Supplemental Services Providers.....	182, 183
Teacher:	
Teacher Preparation Programs.....	146, 147
Teacher Salaries.....	136
Teacher Satisfaction.....	138
Title I:	
Request for Title I Targeted Grants.....	186
Data for Title I Allocation Formulas.....	185
Data on Schools and Students Participating in Title I.....	187
Districts Receiving Small Title I Allocations.....	179
Effect of Increases in Title I Funds.....	178
Guidance on Title II Requirements.....	181
Guidance on Title I Supplemental Education Services.....	165
Title I Funding.....	147
Title I Funds for High-Poverty Schools.....	179
Title I Funds to Schools.....	177
Title I Negotiated Rulemaking.....	175
Title I Per-Child Allocation.....	178
Title I School Improvement and Corrective Action.....	184

Title I Supplemental Services.....	183
Transportation and Title I Funds.....	184
Witnesses.....	123

Foundations for Learning

Adults Served by Even Start and Head Start.....	278
Applying the Lessons of Research in the Classroom.....	223
Biographical Sketches:	
Grover J. (Russ) Whitehurst.....	226
Robert H. Pasternack.....	216
Susan B. Neuman.....	209
California's Title I And IDEA Problems.....	245
Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF).....	297
Comparisons of Head Start, Even Start and Other Preschool Programs.....	304
Coordinating Mental Health Services.....	267
Coordination of Early Childhood Programs and Services.....	262, 282
Cost of Early Education Programs.....	276
Department of Education Management Reforms.....	246
Early Childhood:	
Longitudinal Study (ECLS-K).....	27, 231
Education Experts.....	291
Education Research Initiative.....	291, 319
Educator Academies.....	290
Initiatives.....	227
Special Education Funding.....	292
Early Head Start.....	231, 254
Early Identification of Children with Disabilities.....	210, 262, 272
Early Intervention for Children with Disabilities.....	210, 265
Early Learning Fund (ELOA).....	305
Early Reading First.....	206, 275, 289
Educational Needs of Young Children.....	263
Emotional, Social and Behavior Development Issues.....	249, 264
English Language Acquisition.....	218, 223
Ensuring that all Children Learn to Read Well.....	205
Evaluations:	
Even Start.....	271, 280
Reading First.....	289
Early Childhood Programs.....	277
Even Start:	
Evaluations And Program Improvement.....	271, 281
Program.....	261, 279, 295, 311
Family and Child Experience Survey (FACES).....	227, 231, 252, 306, 318
Good Start, Grow Smart Initiative.....	239, 251, 303, 312, 321
Grants for Early Intervention Related to Mental Health.....	214
Head Start:	
New Accountability Efforts.....	237
Program.....	227, 242, 251, 291, 297-322
Staffing.....	307
Helping Today's Young Children Learn.....	273
IDEA Funding.....	250
Improving Child Care and Head Start Services.....	234
Information for Parents Regarding Positive Learning Environments.....	270
Initiatives to Help Preschool Children with Disabilities.....	294
Introduction of Witnesses.....	203
Longitudinal Study of Title I-Funded Preschool Services.....	285

Opening Statements:	
Grover J. (Russ) Whitehurst.....	217
Robert H. Pasternack.....	210
Sussan B. Neuman.....	203
Wade F. Horn.....	227
Outcomes of Federal Early Childhood Programs.....	274
Prepared Statements:	
Grover J. (Russ) Whitehurst.....	220
Robert H. Pasternack.....	212
Susan B. Neuman.....	205
Wade F. Horn.....	229
Preparing Children to Learn.....	221
Preparing New Teachers.....	269
Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research.....	217
Program Approaches to Building Pre-Reading Skills.....	276
Programs that Address Early Childhood Issues Within OSERS.....	214
Programs that Provide Foundations for Learning.....	207
Project STEP.....	227, 235
Reading Comprehension Research Initiative.....	218
Reading First.....	287, 288, 289, 311
Reading Programs and Textbook Publishers.....	243
Reading To Learn.....	222
Red Schoolhouses.....	292
Research:	
Early Intervention.....	212
Even Start.....	278
Foundations of Learning.....	224
Role of Parents.....	269
Shared Book Reading.....	277
Social, Emotional, and Cognitive Development of Children.....	247, 248
Special Education.....	293
State Flexibility and Reading First Requirements.....	287
Summary of Family Literacy Evaluation Studies.....	283
Supporting Parents with Low Literacy Skills.....	271
Sustaining Early Learning.....	274
Teacher Education and Early Childhood Programs.....	244
Testimony of Edward Zigler, Ph.D. on Reading and Head Start.....	253
Title I Preschool Services.....	285, 286, 295
Transforming Educational Practice.....	224
What Works:	
Clearinghouse and Guides.....	218, 244
In Preschool.....	221

Teacher Recruitment, Preparation, and Development

Accountability for Teacher Preparation Programs.....	326, 331, 399, 418
Accreditation of Teacher Colleges.....	413
Administrative Burdens on Teachers.....	361, 393
Administrator Certification Models and Standards.....	363
Attrition in the Teacher Pipeline.....	412
Biographical Sketches:	
Maria Hernandez Ferrier.....	360
Susan B. Neuman.....	339
Robert H. Pasternack.....	356
Sally L. Stroup.....	332
Grover J. Whitehurst.....	348
Budget for ESL Professional Development.....	359, 407

Budget for Teacher-Related Programs.....	325, 328, 333, 336, 343, 357, 375, 401, 422
Chairman's Concluding Remarks.....	379
Challenges.....	324, 327, 336
Characteristics of Effective Teachers.....	340, 344, 365, 382
Cincinnati Teach Compensation Project.....	345, 367
Class Size Reduction Funding.....	430, 432
Education School Curriculum and Reputation.....	364
Encouraging the Best and Brightest to Enter Teaching.....	410
Federal Student Aid and Loan Forgiveness, Role of.....	325, 330
Flexibility to Hire High-Quality Teachers.....	398
Focus on Outcomes of Teaching.....	395
Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) Teacher Quality Initiatives.....	419
Helping Teachers and Colleges of Education Use Research.....	387
Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	430
Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program.....	333, 336, 401, 410, 412, 422, 431
Insufficient Funds for Education.....	370, 373
Introduction of Witnesses.....	323
Limited English Proficient Students.....	358
Loan Forgiveness:	
Expanding Loan Forgiveness.....	404
Number of Loan Forgiveness Awards.....	405
Role of Federal Student Aid and Loan Forgiveness.....	325, 330
Math and Science Partnership Program.....	334, 337, 407
Math and Science Teachers.....	408
Measuring Teacher Effectiveness.....	367
Measuring the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs.....	393
Models of Successful Programs.....	371
National Board for Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) (see also Teacher Certification):	
NBPTS Certification as a Measure of Teacher Ability.....	368
NBPTS Certification Process.....	390
Results of NBPTS Certification.....	391
Need for Qualified Teachers.....	323, 333, 335, 341, 345, 351, 357, 372, 381, 387
NICHD Pilot Study of Reading Instruction In D.C. Schools.....	385
Opening Remarks:	
Maria Hernandez Ferrier.....	357
Susan B. Neuman.....	333
Robert H. Pasternack.....	349
Sally L. Stroup.....	324
Grover J. Whitehurst.....	340
Pathways to Teacher Program.....	384
PRAXIS Exam.....	365, 396
Prepared Statements:	
Maria Hernandez Ferrier.....	358
Susan B. Neuman.....	335
Robert H. Pasternack.....	351
Sally L. Stroup.....	327
Grover J. Whitehurst.....	343
Profession of Teaching:.....	366
Recent Immigrant Students.....	406
Regular Education Teachers Working with Children with Disabilities.....	405
Research Related to Teaching:	

Budget Request for OERI.....	343
Helping Teachers and Colleges of Education Use Research.....	387
New Research Initiatives.....	341, 346
Translating Research into Practice.....	346, 386, 394
Retaining New Teachers.....	412
School Leadership Program Funding.....	390, 420, 424
Schools of Education Adopting Public Schools.....	368
Shortages of Bilingual and ESL Teachers.....	357, 406
Shortages of Special Education Personnel.....	349, 351, 387
Special Education:	
Funding to Help States Meet Personnel Needs.....	354, 389
High Turnover in Special Education Personnel.....	350, 352, 387
Regular Education Teachers Working with Disabilities.....	405
Shortages of Special Education Personnel.....	349, 351, 387
Special Education Personnel.....	352, 387, 426
Special Education Professional Preparation Program....	352, 402, 427
Training Teachers of Children with Disabilities.....	349, 392
State Policies on Tenure, Compensation, and Certification.....	361
Targeted Professional Development.....	363
Teacher Certification (see also NBPTS):	
Alternative Certification Routes.....	378, 398
Models and Standards.....	362
Pathways to Teaching Program.....	384
State Policies on Tenure, Compensation, and Certification....	361
Teachers Not Certified or Teaching Out of Field.....	399
Transition to Teaching Program.....	333, 337, 411
Troops-To-Teachers and Teach For America.....	333, 337, 383
Teacher Preparation and Support.....	327
Teacher Qualification Requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:	
Budget for Teacher Qualification Requirements.....	429
Cost of New Teacher Qualification Requirements.....	377, 400, 429
Meeting the New Teacher Qualification Requirements.....	377
New Teacher Qualification Requirements.....	333, 335, 402
Requirements for Vocational Education Teachers.....	430
Teacher and Paraprofessional Qualifications.....	428
Training Highly Qualified Teachers.....	415
Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) Program:	
Applicants and Recipients of TQE State Grants.....	416
Distribution of TQE Program Funds.....	414
Funding for the TQE Program.....	324, 327, 413, 425
Override of Statutory Restriction on TQE Grants.....	418
Teacher Recruitment and Retention.....	330, 412, 423
Teacher Recruitment and Retention Hearing--Public Witnesses.....	435
Thomas G. Carroll, Executive Director, National Commission on Teaching and Learning.....	446
Lew Finch, Superintendent, Cedar Rapids Community School District, Iowa.....	449
Lawrence J. Johnson, Dean of the University of Cincinnati College of Education.....	435
Aubrilin Reeder, Teacher, East Los Angeles School District, California.....	440
Teacher Salaries.....	389, 425
Teachers and Student Achievement.....	382
Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students.....	357, 359
Teaching as a Specialized Enterprise.....	341
Teaching Diverse Populations.....	391

Transition of Teaching Program.....	333, 337, 411
Translating Research into Practice.....	346, 386, 393
Troops-To-Teachers and Teach For America.....	333, 337, 383

High Schools and Transition into the Workforce

Accountability:	
Accountability and Impact of Vocational and Adult Education..	571
Accountability Challenges.....	513
Accountability for Children with Disabilities.....	514
Assessment and Accountability.....	514
Flexibility and Accountability.....	510
Promoting Accountability.....	471
Adult Education and Family Literacy.....	470, 551, 598, 599
Adult Educational Needs.....	500
Adults with Disabilities.....	485
Aligning Education and Employment.....	521
Alternative to Traditional 4-Year Schools.....	573
Assistive Technology Act of 1998.....	577
Beyond High School.....	500
Biographical Sketchs:	
Assistant Secretary Carol D'Amico.....	473
Assistant Secretary Susan Neuman.....	509
Assistant Secretary Robert Pasternack.....	492
Assistant Secretary Sally Stroup.....	483
Assistant Secretary Grover (Russ) Whitehurst.....	502
Chairman's Opening and Closing Remarks.....	463, 533
Choice for Children with Disabilities.....	519
College Access.....	474, 479
College Costs.....	602
College Enrollment Rates and Completion Gaps.....	474, 597
College Preparation.....	478
Community Colleges and Continuing Education.....	575
Comparisons with Other Countries.....	498
Data Management.....	514
Dropouts.....	531, 582
Connecting Dropouts with Jobs.....	574
Decreasing Postsecondary Dropout Rate.....	541
Dropouts in Big Cities.....	493
High School Dropout Rates.....	588
Johns Hopkins Study of High School Dropouts.....	583
Dual Enrollment Pilot Programs.....	537
Early Emphasis on Academics.....	521
Education and Employment.....	517
Education Reform and Technical Education.....	539
Educational Attainment.....	601
Emerging Role of Postsecondary Education Institutions.....	468
Full Funding.....	530
GEAR UP Technical Amendments.....	525
GED Recipients and Postsecondary Schooling.....	539
HBCU Funding.....	527, 528
Higher Education Act Technical Amendments.....	526
Higher Education Programs, FY 2003 Budget.....	526
High Growth Occupations.....	552
High School:	
Achievement.....	493
Completion Rates.....	495

Coursework.....	494
Excellence.....	464, 468
Funds for High Schools and Technical Institutions.....	512
Graduation.....	484, 594
Research on High School Reform.....	495
Smaller High Schools.....	543, 544
State High School Exit Exams.....	586
Student Achievement in High School.....	497
Summit on High School Reform.....	584
Transforming High School into Instruments of Achievement.....	499
Identifying Workforce Needs.....	552
Improving the Academic Achievement of Disadvantaged Students.....	506
Improving the Quality of Instruction.....	507
Increased Flexibility.....	508
International Education.....	476, 603
Math and Science Education in Middle and High School.....	499
Model College Readiness and Career Development Programs.....	547
Need for ``Seamless'' Education Systems.....	511
New Skills Education Credential.....	575
Office of Disability Employment Policy.....	570
Opening Remarks:	
Assistant Secretary Carol D'Amico.....	463
Assistant Secretary Susan Neuman.....	503
Assistant Secretary Robert Pasternack.....	484
Assistant Secretary Sally Stroup.....	474
Assistant Secretary Grover (Russ) Whitehurst.....	493
Pell Grants.....	475, 599, 600, 605
Percentage of High School Graduates Entering College.....	579
Prepared Statements:	
Assistant Secretary Carol D'Amico.....	467
Assistant Secretary Susan Neuman.....	505
Assistant Secretary Robert Pasternack.....	487
Assistant Secretary Sally Stroup.....	478
Assistant Secretary Grover (Russ) Whitehurst.....	497
Percentage of Students Attending Large High Schools.....	579
Projects with Industry.....	562, 564, 565, 567, 568
Reading Comprehension Initiative.....	495
Relevant Education.....	511
Research and Statistics.....	493
Role of Community Colleges.....	464
Safe and Drug-Free Learning Environments.....	507
School-to-Work.....	590
Skills for the New Economy.....	518
Skills Necessary for Technical Jobs.....	520
Smaller Learning Communities.....	580, 581, 604
Special Education:	
National Activities.....	485, 489
Personnel.....	484
Results for Students with Disabilities.....	487
Special Education and Demand for VR Services.....	562
Special Education and Voc. Rehab. State Grant Programs.....	488
Study on Promoting School Connectedness.....	579
Supporting Institutions that Serve Disadvantaged Students.....	480
Teacher Shortage in Inner Cities.....	532
Technical Education.....	529
Need for Technical Education.....	518
State Technical Education Systems.....	529

Technical Schools and Community Colleges.....	535
Tech-Prep Program.....	542
Training for High-Skill Jobs.....	519
Ticket to Work Program.....	569
Top 25 Fastest Growing Occupations, 2002-2010 National Projections.....	523
Top 25 Fastest Growing Occupations, 2002-2010 Pennsylvania Projections.....	524
Tracking Student Progress.....	515
Transition from High School to Higher Education.....	538
Transition to the Workforce.....465, 545, 546, 574,	589
TRIO and GEAR UP.....474,	526
TRIO Programs Evaluation.....	576
Under Employment of the Disabled.....	532
Unmet Financial Need.....600,	602
Vocational and Adult Education Evaluations.....	572
Vocational and Adult Education Incentive Grants.....590,	592
Vocational Education.....469, 536,	593
Vocational Rehabilitation:	
Consolidation of Vocational Rehabilitation Funds.....	559
Cost of Living Increase.....	561
Individuals Served in the VR System.....	556
Program Order of Selection.....	568
Research on the Effectiveness of the Vocational Rehabilitation System.....	548
State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies.....	553
Witnesses.....	463
Workforce Supply Versus Demand.....	528

Department of Education Congressional Justifications

Education for the Disadvantaged.....	610
Impact Aid.....	685
School Improvement Programs.....	720
Indian Education.....	863
English Language Acquisition.....	881
Special Education.....	900
Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research.....	979
American Printing House for the Blind.....	1086
National Technical Institute for the Deaf.....	1098
Gallaudet University.....	1115
Vocational and Adult Education.....	1131
Student Financial Assistance.....	1188
Student Loans Overview.....	1236
Federal Family Education Loan Program Account.....	1255
Higher Education.....	1263
Howard University.....	1360
College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans Program Account....	1372
Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program Account.....	1383
Education Research, Statistics, and Assessment.....	1394
Salaries and Expenses Overview.....	1444
Program Administration.....	1470
Office for Civil Rights.....	1491
Office of the Inspector General.....	1515
Student Aid Administration.....	1534

